Effective and Ineffective University Teaching from the Students' and Faculty's Perspectives: Matched or Mismatched Expectations?

Submitted by

Sylvie Marguerite Raymond

To the University of Exeter as a thesis in part requirement for the
Doctor of Education (EdD)

November, 2008

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own has been identified and that no material has been previously submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other university.

Signature: …….

ABSTRACT

EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE UNIVERSITY TEACHING FROM THE STUDENTS' AND FACULTY'S PERSPECTIVES: MATCHED OR MISMATCHED EXPECTATIONS?

SYLVIE MARGUERITE RAYMOND

This paper reports on the findings from an investigation conducted in the Arab Gulf region into student and faculty perceptions of effective and ineffective teaching practices at the university level. Samples were drawn from both genders in two dissimilar academic programs: the university preparatory intensive English program (IEP) and the mainstream science program. Specifically, this study focuses on the characteristics of effective and ineffective teaching from the point of view of four population groups: English students, English faculty, science students and science faculty. The method of enquiry made use of both interviews and a questionnaire. Means, ranking, and standard deviation followed by other analyses indicated that there was a high degree of similarity between students and faculty with respect to the perceived attributes of effective and ineffective teaching. It appears that the effective teacher is the mirror image of the ineffective by being imbued with a generous dose of personality traits in addition to skills. Both faculty and students in this research conducted in the Gulf depicted the excellent university professor as someone who: (1) is respectful, (2) makes classes interesting, (3) is fair in evaluating, (4) cares about students' success, (5) shows a love for their subject, (6) is friendly, (7) encourages questions and discussion, (8) is always well prepared and organized, and (9) makes difficult subjects easy to learn. Findings of students' and faculty's perspectives suggest that effective teaching is the blending of both personality and ability factors. The key factor, however, remains the teacher's personality.

Acknowledgements

Without the tremendous support of my life partner, Douglas William Warrington, this thesis would not have been possible. There are no words to express my utmost gratitude to my companion for his direct contributions to this daunting project and to my life over the past six years.

I also want to thank my supervisors Dr. Malcolm McDonald and Dr. Salah Troudi for their encouragement and faith in me along this arduous journey.

My appreciation also goes to my colleagues and supervisors who voluntarily participated in interviews and completed survey instruments. I want to particularly acknowledge Deborah Wilson, Mark Algren, Pelly Shaw, Sharon Gilbertson, Milton Gilbertson, Scott Rousseu, Leo Schmitt, Angela Waigand, Amanda Ward, Krystie Wills, Tina Driscoll, Aftab Ahmed, Leslie Giesen, Olivia Riordan and Jane Pringle for their continuous support.

I am also grateful for the assistance of all students and faculty who took the time to share their views with me by piloting questionnaires, participating in interviews and filling out survey instruments.

There are other people who have in many ways provided crucial support for me and the thesis including: Holly Skelton, the librarian who went out of her way to provide me with resources, interlibrary loans and assistance throughout my doctoral program, and Saleh Saafin who kindly accepted to email me an electronic copy of his PhD thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Reasons for undertaking this study

Effective teaching is an art and no easy endeavour. Several years ago, I became fascinated with the question of what it takes to be an outstanding educator. In 1997, in order to satisfy my curiosity and my MEd degree requirement with the University of Sheffield, I conducted a cross-cultural study of Emirati, Canadian and Chinese students' perceptions of characteristics associated with excellent teaching. Findings indicated some similarities in students' perceptions of the excellent teaching common to the three study groups; however, two important differences emerged in the students' perceptions of the good instructor.

Eight years later, in my continuing quest to better understand the characteristics associated with effective teaching, I approached the same topic from a different perspective, using a different methodology and different population groups. In addition, instead of looking exclusively at students' perceptions, I included teachers' perceptions from different disciplines as well. After conducting an extensive literature search, it became apparent that not a single published study conducted in the Gulf region had approached the topic in the same manner as this research thesis. This is not to infer that the quest to unlock the secrets of excellent teaching is anything new, as the following quote illustrates:

> Good teachers have been studied ever since Plato described how Socrates taught by asking questions of his audience. Recent findings shed light on two characteristics of good teachers: their personality and their ability. However, more attention has been paid to teachers' practices and opinions than to students' views (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001:185).

Nor is it my intent to lead the reader into believing that there is a direct and undisputed link between undergraduates' learning and lecturers' teaching. "Robust, useful theories of classroom teaching do not yet exist. Theories that consider connections between classroom teaching and students' learning are even less developed" (Hiebert & Grouws, 2007:373). Yet many, including Hiebert and

Grouws, would argue that effective teachers have an impact on students' progress. However, despite the efforts of many researchers over more than a century, a direct link between specific teaching methods and student learning remains undiscovered, and it is into this endeavour that I am drawn, fully aware that I am entering an area of dispute between theory development and empirical work. I take confidence from the contention that it would be unwise to idly wait for such theories to emerge without conducting research that may ultimately lead to the establishment of such theories.

1.2 Why another study on teaching effectiveness?

Most studies reviewed for this thesis have examined characteristics of effective teachers from the perspectives of either teachers or students and not one, to my knowledge, examined both effective and ineffective characteristics in a single study from the perceptions of four population groups in a Middle Eastern setting. In addition, there appears to be few studies that have been purposely designed to examine effective teaching characteristics from the perceptions of those who receive and those who deliver university level teaching. Witcher *et al.* (2001) help to make this point when they write: "Although the literature abounds with information regarding teacher effectiveness, the majority of these articles do not represent primary studies" (2001:47). Furthermore, most of the investigations reviewed employed a single mode of data collection, such as interviews, questionnaires or essay writings, as opposed to incorporating elements of both qualitative and quantitative analyses techniques within the same framework.

Therefore, the goal of the present study was to investigate what both students and faculty viewed as important characteristics of effective and ineffective teaching, with the intent of comparing their responses to descriptors provided in cross-cultural empirical studies. Also of interest to me as a researcher was to investigate mediating factors that may have had an influence on the responses of the participants, such as the program of study (English pre-requisite program as compared to a mainstream university major, and gender). It was hoped that findings from this study would

help to determine the extent to which the perceptions of students differ from or are similar to those of faculty, and help me better understand students' expectations.

There were three primary reasons why I wanted to undertake a study on teaching effectiveness. First, I endeavoured to satisfy my own curiosity as to whether the portrait/image of the excellent teacher depicted in other studies, primarily conducted in the West, matched the descriptions of the excellent teacher from students with a Middle Eastern background. Second, I hoped that investigating faculty's and students' perceptions of teaching excellence in the Gulf Region would take me beyond the classical textbook definition which, in my opinion, can offer an inadequate and a somewhat biased westernized view of the good teacher. Third, the most compelling reason for doing this research is my desire to better understand what students want and need. By keeping myself abreast with students' expectations, I am better equipped to promote superior learning, motivation and the love for learning in my students, thus helping myself, and, hopefully, others to become better educators.

1.3 Statement of the problem

University teachers are often heard expressing concern that students and faculty differ in their views of what constitutes effective teachers/teaching. If faculty and students do not agree on the criteria of what constitutes effective teaching, then faculty members may be suspicious or sceptical of students evaluating their teaching "… believing their students may use different priorities than they themselves would in arriving at overall evaluations" (Feldman, 1988:292). This is especially pertinent nowadays, since more universities and colleges are assessing their faculty based on student feedback. Therefore, the main intent of this study was to find out whether there were consistencies and inconsistencies between students and faculty in terms of specific characteristics students felt to be more important to teaching excellence than did faculty at the same institution, and vice versa. Hence, the primary objective of this study was to discover if there existed only one portrait of the effective teacher which cut across all four diverse population groups sampled

in this study – English students, science students, English faculty, and science faculty.

Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What are the predominant characteristics used by the study participants to describe excellent teaching?

2. To what extent are student perceptions of **effective** teaching similar to those of faculty?

3. To what extent are student perceptions of **ineffective** teaching similar to those of faculty?

4. Are the descriptors used to describe effective teaching amongst the four population groups focused more on the ability or on the personality view?

5. To what extent do mediating factors such as academic discipline and participants' gender have an effect on the portrait of the excellent teacher?

1.4 Definition of terms

Worthy of mention is that the terms 'effective teacher' and 'effective teaching' are used interchangeably because as Leinhardt (1988:147) postulates "… teachers' thoughts and actions … do not occur within a vacuum … we can learn much about the art of teaching if we seriously consider the nature of the environment in which teachers work and reason." In order to avoid ambiguity or misunderstanding, what follows are some terms which are frequently used in this study.

Effective teaching – is synonymous with excellent, successful, outstanding, expert, good, above average, superlative, and superior teaching. "Teaching expertise is always defined in this research by at least one, and usually several, external

criteria" (Leinhardt, 1993:12). Other 'criteria' used throughout this thesis are the synonymous terms **excellent teaching** and **teaching excellence**, chosen purposely to reduce word-weariness for the reader.

Ineffective teaching – serves as a synonym for poor, inadequate, below average, less than expected teaching. To Leinhardt, "When teaching is seen as complex, then poor teaching is a consequence of failure to deal effectively with some aspect of the complexity" (1993:6)

Effective teacher – from the personality perspective, an effective college level teacher is one who demonstrates "… closeness, warmth, and enthusiasm (immediacy) … perceived physical and psychological closeness of the teacher to the student …" (Walls *et al.*, 2002:40). From the ability perspective, the crucial factors of the effective teacher are being skilled, knowledgeable and experienced (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001). Effective teachers know how to create an effective learning environment by being organized, prepared, and clear (Walls *et al.*, 2002).

Ineffective teacher – from the personality perspective, ineffective college level teachers are described by Walls *et al.*, 2002 as creating a tense classroom environment, being cold, abusive and uncaring. From the ability perspective, ineffective college level teachers are inept in pedagogy, deliver boring lectures and create an unproductive learning environment (Walls *et al.*, 2002).

Throughout this thesis, two research constructs have been purposely chosen for comparison and as a method of organization based on the work done by other researchers over the years. This approach is not without its critics who justifiably argue, amongst other things, that it is difficult to categorize some teaching behaviours into one consortium or the other, and furthermore, that perhaps not all teaching actions can be classified into either, or even both of the two categories. The two research classifications adopted for this thesis are Personality and Ability and both are discussed in more detail in the body of this document.

Personality traits – can be described as the inherent skills each unique, individual human being possesses inside. These are the natural, innate talents that are God-given to each person and are extremely difficult to evaluate objectively; these traits primarily reside in the affective domain. Examples would include passion for one's subject matter, sensitivity to students' needs and friendliness to students.

Ability skills – can be described as learned or practiced cognitive and psychomotor skills such as the ability to operate a computer or an overhead projector, or the ability to effectively relate difficult theoretical topics to real-life examples.

1.5 Contribution of this study

The need for this study arises from a professional desire to better serve my students. It has been my observation while working with different levels of students at different institutes in the United Arab Emirates that some teachers interface very well with their students and are highly successful in contributing to their knowledge, while others appear to have difficulties in the classroom from the initial contact with them. This study therefore sets out to discover if the views of students and faculty on what constitutes excellent teaching are consistent or divergent. Furthermore, this study should help to fill a void in the literature on what constitutes effective teaching by offering the perspectives of both students and faculty specific to a Gulf region setting. The results obtained and implications drawn could be of benefit to teachers from other parts of the world who may be considering a move to the Gulf region, as well as to teachers elsewhere who are receiving students from all corners of the globe, to better understand student needs from another culture in the classroom environment. In addition, I am motivated towards contributing even in the smallest way towards the development of theories which can link classroom teaching to students' learning. Finally, I see this work as a contribution to help guide those who are involved in the development of future teachers.

1.6 Contextualization of the study

To familiarize the reader with the learning and the teaching contexts of the study, what follows is a summary of the two programs – the Intensive English Program (IEP), and the Department of Sciences at a large university in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Also provided is a description of the students and faculty study participants who volunteered for this research project.

The Intensive English Program is comprised of a set of courses designed to prepare EFL students to succeed in the mainstream undergraduate academic program of the university where English is the required medium of instruction. The Intensive English Program, as the name suggests, is rigorous in nature and accepts students at all levels of English proficiency from novice to advanced. The majority of students are fee-payers and attend five one-hour English classes daily, five days per week from Sunday to Thursday in the following skill areas: reading, writing, listening, speaking and grammar. The exit requirement into the mainstream undergraduate university program is a minimum score of 510 on the paper-based Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or 180 on the computer-based TOEFL (CBT). After students successfully complete the IEP, three credits are awarded towards their study in the regular undergraduate university program. Students may then choose from a wide variety of science majors leading to the following Bachelor of Science (BS) degrees in Environmental Science, Business Administration, Finance, Management Information Systems, Computer Science, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering. This accredited, semi-privately owned university caters to all international students. Courses taken and credits earned may be transferred to accredited colleges and universities in the United States.

The student body consists primarily of Middle Eastern, Arabic native language students entering the program holding high school diplomas. Students are primarily progeny of affluent expatriate families or are expatriate Arab students visiting on temporary student visas from neighbouring countries and typically living on campus. Few students are Emirati nationals and even fewer are from Western or

Asian origins. Most students attending this accredited university wish to complete their undergraduate studies and then continue with their educational pursuits in North America.

The teaching faculty instructing in the IEP program and in the mainstream programs differ in their areas of specialization, qualifications and rank. English instructors in the IEP program are all from Western countries and all hold master's degrees as terminal degrees in teaching English as a foreign language and in related fields such as applied linguistics. In the Department of Sciences, faculty (professors, assistant professors and associate professors) were comprised of Western and Arab expatriates and all hold PhDs and/or doctorate degrees in their related fields. University faculty members differ in terms of their employment packages, but all IEP and science faculty are expatriate employees, primarily from Western countries. Their teaching loads vary according to their rank, area of specialization and qualifications. They are all under the sponsorship of the university and receive generous salaries and benefit packages. Hence, faculty members tend to keep their positions for lengthy periods, and are thus given the opportunity to develop their cultural awareness and familiarity with their student population and program requirements. With a reasonably low turn-over rate, it is my belief that faculty solicited for this study would therefore better understand the environment and students' needs than a transient faculty workforce. In addition, students are experienced with the process of faculty evaluation as they are required to complete faculty evaluations every semester throughout the program. Thus, the student and teacher participants enlisted for this study should have been competent to provide valid information in response to interviews and the questionnaire instrument developed for that purpose. More descriptive data on the study participants and questionnaire instrument can be found in Chapter 3, Methodology.

1.7 Summary

Chapter 1 introduced the purpose of this study, provided the specific questions to be answered, defined the terms used in the study, highlighted the contribution of the study and offered a contextual background. Chapter 2 presents the construct prior to reviewing relevant studies contained in the literature. Chapter 3 addresses the methodology, describes the study participants, data collection procedures and the data analysis and ends with a discussion on the study limitations and assumptions made. Chapter 4 presents and discusses the findings. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the findings, offers conclusions and implications based upon study results, makes recommendations for further study and finally, concludes with personal reflections.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to the literature review

Although there are many avenues of literature that could have been linked to the phenomenon of teacher/teaching effectiveness, I have specifically chosen to limit the discussion to four interconnected areas: the conceptual framework, a review of the general literature on teacher/teaching excellence, a discussion behind teacher development applicable to teaching effectiveness, and empirical studies specifically focussing on similarities and dissimilarities of how study participants from diverse groups view effective teaching. Throughout the literature reviewed on effective teaching, two inter-related domains have emerged: teacher effectiveness outside the classroom and teacher effectiveness within the classroom.

Worthy of mention is that for the purpose of this research undertaking, the general literature was reviewed in addition to literature specific to teacher training and development. By "general", it denotes a teacher from no specific grade level nor from a specific discipline, and not focussed exclusively on language teaching literature. The reason I chose this approach is that reviewing foreign language teaching literature would be too restrictive, since my study encompassed both students and faculty from two academic disciplines (science as well as English language). A synthesis of the literature on teacher development was included to add an element of practical perspective to contrast with theoretical issues raised in research studies.

2.2 Conceptual framework - two research constructs

Defining good teaching has been a mainstay of the discourse of educational research for centuries, going back as far as Plato's Socratic dialogue – a method of teaching by asking questions of the audience (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001). Throughout the educational and psychology literature, different definitions of teaching/teacher effectiveness abound (Anderson, 2004; Day, 2004; Borich, 2000; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Hay McBer, 2000; Kyriacou, 1998; Robertson, 1996; Lowman, 1995; Stones,

1992; Chickering & Gamson, 1991). Definitions of the good teacher have evolved over more than half a century from the initial trait paradigm toward behaviourism and cognitivism (Shulman, 2004; Calderhead, 1996; Lowyck, 1994; Waxman & Walberg, 1991). Behaviourism emerged from B.F. Skinner's behavioural theory (1957). Unanswered questions arising from trait theories gave opportunity to researchers to focus not on the traits of individuals so much as how the behaviour and actions of effective teachers differed from those of less effective ones. Behavioural theories are concerned with answering the question: What behaviours should teachers adopt to be most effective? The behavioural perspective argues that there are four interrelated dimensions to teaching effectiveness: support, interaction, goal emphasis, and facilitation (Shulman, 2004). It was criticised, however, as the model ignored both the environment and the characteristics of teachers and learners. The cognitive theory, on the other hand, focuses on how meaning is created and was born in reaction to behaviouristic principles of effectiveness. Albert Bandura (1997) is one of the fathers of the cognitivist movement who argues that special attention should be paid to the cognitive development of the learner. These shifts in theory are more frequently referred to in the current literature as two broad research constructs – the personality and the ability perspective. In a study conducted with pre-service teachers, for example, Witcher *et al.* (2001:54) found that:

> … preservice teachers who rated a personal characteristic as being evidence of an effective teacher were <u>not</u> more likely to rate a management and instructional technique. This suggests that personal characteristics and management and instructional techniques are deemed by preservice teachers to be independent constructs.

What follows is a discussion of these two research classifications of teaching excellence – personality and ability. These two constructs were chosen to help organize the literature review and directly influenced the research design since many of the researchers examined built their studies around this view. This is not to suggest, however, that all teaching characteristics can be linked to one of the two constructs, nor to suggest that they are mutually exclusive as we shall see later in this discussion, nor is it to imply that the personality and ability factors are the only method of organizing effective teaching attributes.

The multi-dimensional character of teaching quality and attempts to classify effective teaching traits have been discussed by, amongst others, Fernandez & Mateo (1992:676) who report that the "… number of dimensions resulting from factor analysis on these instruments usually varies between two and nine." They also justify a research approach which uses the two constructs of ability and personality since these "… dimensions clearly are essential to any thorough examination of teaching quality" (1992:676).

As mentioned above, following the approach taken by Beishuizen *et al.* (2001), Witcher *et al.* (2001), Fernandez & Mateo (1992) and others, the personality/ability constructs were chosen specifically to add to a growing inventory of effective teaching characteristics. The long-term objective is to link personality/ability data with the actual outcomes of teaching performance, even though this approach may take many years to evolve. In addition to the difficulty of linking "… some features of teaching with some types of learning" (Hiebert & Grouws, 2007:378), there currently is no theoretical framework to employ this two-pronged personality/ability approach to correlate students' learning performance and teachers' characteristics. In addition, the use of personality classification is perhaps one of the more controversial topics in academic discussion today, at least amongst those in the educational philosophy discipline. Having been practically silenced in academia since the end of the 1980s, personality psychology began rearing its head once again in the 1990s not by academia, but by industrial psychologists using pre-employment personality testing as effective predictors of job performance (Hogan, 2005).

Perhaps the greatest quandary with personality measures is that they reside primarily within the affective domain of knowledge, and therefore are extremely difficult, if not impossible (currently) to evaluate objectively. Ability characteristics, on the other hand, are less subjective as 'ability' implies a focus on the teacher's knowledge, skills and experience, on their being able to consistently perform measurable actions in terms of explicitly stated performance, conditions and standards. For example, the ability of a teacher to routinely incorporate multi-media

into his/her lessons can be observed in action, compared to a pre-determined standard, and graded accordingly.

Personality characteristics, on the other hand, remain elusive. What yardstick is currently available to measure the teacher's passion for the subject being taught, the psychological closeness to his/her students, or of his/her understanding of and compassion for his/her students' feelings? Indeed, some would argue that personality doesn't exist, claiming that it is the situational factors which determine the teacher's behaviours and actions, not his/her personality. Yet what cannot be denied in the face of reason is that personality is all about people, and it is not to be forgotten is that this study is all about trying to better understand a specific classification of people – teachers. To be able to ultimately make links between teachers' personalities and abilities to student outcomes will require proponents to continue towards this goal, despite those who would oppose such efforts simply because they lie beyond the boundaries of the current thinking box.

Finally, Beishuizen *et al.* (2001) provide perhaps the most convincing support for the two-characteristic categorization approach to data collection when they point out the obvious: when students and teachers provide feedback on teachers' reputations, trait words from the personality perspective are frequently used. The question therefore begs: why not capitalize on this data? It is this last argument that convinces me to follow the road less travelled. Despite the unpopularity of and limitations surrounding the personality/ability categorization strategy, with patience, collaboration, and over time, direct links between teachers' personalities and abilities, and effectiveness in the classroom, I believe, will emerge and serve a useful purpose in helping faculty to better serve their students.

2.2.1 The personality view

Research on good teaching viewed in terms of the teacher's traits or personality can be traced as far back to the 1920s and is closely related to the humanistic tradition in education. The focus is on teachers as persons and on negotiating cooperative relationships with students. As Yoder *et al.* (1993:4)

explain, “The working premise here is that the teacher as a person and the relationship she or he develops with the students is a critical component of effectiveness”. Carl Rogers is often referred to as one of the fathers of humanistic theory, an approach that emerged in the 1950s in reaction to behaviourism (Rogers & Frieberg, 1969). It focuses mainly on the understanding of what it means to be human.

The characteristics of good teachers based in terms of the personality view encompass personal human qualities such as: intelligence, self-confidence, fairness, respect, caring, sensitivity, flexibility, enjoyment of students, open-mindedness, friendliness, providing individual attention, kindness, enthusiasm, having a good sense of humour, making learning interesting, being serious, being hospitable towards students, teaching style, trust, credibility, and even teacher attractiveness and height (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001; Walsh & Maffei in Smith *et al.*, 1994). The trait theory assumes that there are identifiable qualities that set the effective educator apart from others and that these special qualities enable the excellent teacher to exert influence over students. Walsh & Maffei (in Smith *et al.*, 1994) shed light when they postulate “The student-professor relationship is important not only for its own sake, but also because it is closely linked to learning” (23). Some of the most insightful definitions in support of the relational view of effective teaching are expressed as follows: to Walls *et al.* (2002:40), the “… emotional climate constitutes a strong if not predominant construct associated with effective teaching”; to Carson (1996:10), “… a personal connection between teacher and student may, in fact, be the single most important avenue to student growth and to students’ satisfaction with their education”; to Palmer (1998:3), “… the human heart is the source of good teaching” while for Wubbels *et al.* (1997:82) “… exceptional teaching can also be described in terms of teacher-student relationships”. Clearly, personal relationships between effective teachers and their students are viewed as important to these researchers.

Day (2004) brings Goleman’s emotional intelligence into his definition of an ardent teacher. “Passion is associated with enthusiasm, caring, commitment, and hope, which are themselves key characteristics of effective teaching” (2004: xiii).

The work by Goleman (2002) on emotional intelligence adds a critical component to teaching effectiveness. Emotional intelligence (EI), also referred to as "EQ" (Emotional Quotient), encompasses social relationship management which can be applied to teaching/leadership, self-awareness, and self-management. Building good relationships is one of several components of teaching effectiveness and it falls under the umbrella of 'relationship management'. It is about working effectively with others, including the handling of frustrations and disagreements. It is having the capacity to guide, motivate, influence, and persuade followers to share a common vision. It is about holding the learners' best interest in mind by developing their abilities through positive and constructive feedback. Through teamwork and collaboration, it is about being an agent of change who initiates, manages, and leads learners towards something new, something mind-expanding.

Social awareness is another key element to the management of relationships. Empathy appears to play a vital role in effective teaching. Goleman defines empathy as "… sensing others' emotions, understanding their perspective and taking active interest in their concerns" (2002:39). In addition to empathy, an effective teacher, according to Goleman, must be politically aware within his organization and must meet the learners' needs. Emotionally intelligent teachers acknowledge that people have different needs and offer options and choices that will appeal to a variety of learners within a group. Preferences in how we learn, relate to others, make decisions, and take in information are other important areas of social awareness.

Self-awareness is also included in the domain of emotional intelligence. Self-awareness means the ability to pause and step back from a difficult situation and ask oneself, "What is happening? Why is this happening? What does this mean? What can I learn from this?" It is about handling our own emotions and those of others effectively. It is also about being aware of one's own strengths and limitations and understanding one's self-worth and abilities.

Last, according to Goleman (2002), the greater the number of self-management qualities one possesses (impulse control, optimism, enthusiasm,

hopefulness, flexibility, honesty, integrity, trustworthiness, a thirst for self-improvement and a desire to take initiative), the better equipped one is at applying different teaching styles to different situations and the better one is at building good relationships. Furthermore, the more EI qualities a teacher possesses, the more efficient he/she is likely to be in making use of a range of appropriate teaching styles and thus be able to govern each different class of students and their individual, collective, and constantly shifting influences which impact upon the learning situation. Sockett (in Day, 2004) helps us to understand the importance of the effective teacher's integrity with the assertion "… that the techniques of teaching are always subservient to a moral end and, therefore, that the moral character of the teacher is of prime importance" (25).

However, the personality view of good teaching which is grounded in the qualities of the teacher is not easily or directly classified, measurable or observable and, as discussed above, has limitations. Special characteristics such as values, experiences and insights remain until today to be isolated. And even if they do become identified at some point in the future, it will continue to present a challenge to establish direct links between such identifiable teacher qualities and teaching performance. Nonetheless, many researchers including those mentioned above, would not be entirely satisfied with a definition of teacher/teaching effectiveness that focused solely on the personality perspective.

2.2.2 The ability view

The unanswered questions arising from personality theories gave researchers opportunity to focus not on the traits of individuals so much as on how the behaviour and actions of effective teachers affected their students – how the behaviours of effective teachers differed from those of ineffective ones. Behavioural theories are concerned with answering the question, "What behaviours should teachers adopt to be most effective?" Therefore, research on effective teaching belonging to the ability perspective emerged from the rise of behaviourism which was the dominant paradigm in the 1960s. Process-product research was born and upheld its name since its goal was to link teaching processes (teacher behaviours/actions) to students'

performance (product) on standardized tests (Shulman, 2004). Despite being unfashionable in certain areas of educational research, the view of process-product research which attempts to identify teacher behaviours that contribute to student achievement is still held favourably by many educators today. They believe that teaching effectiveness can be defined in terms of a plethora of skills and behaviours (efficient, reflective, insightful), knowledge (content, pedagogical, social, tacit knowledge), and experience of good teachers (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001; Hay McBer, 2000; Wubbels *et al.*, 1997; Shulman in Sternberg & Horvath, 1995; House, 1991). Dunne & Wragg (1994) for example, list a total of 70 different attributes that the effective teacher could aspire towards, yet only two of those 70 attributes acknowledge the personality side of the teacher (*show interest in children as people* and *maintain warm relationships*). Amongst the numerous skills-oriented definitions available, one provided by Anderson (2004:25) is that "… an effective teacher is one who quite consistently achieves goals – be they self-selected or imposed – that are related either directly or indirectly to student learning". A similar definition focussing on goals and objectives offered by Fuhrmann & Grasha in Centra (1993), based on the process-product (behaviourist) perspective and which also helps us to understand the ability perspective is this:

> … effective teaching is demonstrated when the instructor can write objectives relevant to the course content, specify classroom procedures … and student behaviors needed to teach and learn such objectives, and show that students have achieved the objectives after exposure to the instruction (43).

Despite the strong hold of process-product research in education today (the search for relationships between teaching processes and what students learn), many critics, including Lowyck (1994) and Waxman & Walburg (1991) point out the shortcomings of attempting to make direct correlations between teachers' behaviours and student achievements. It is criticized as the model suggests a single best style of teaching while ignoring the environment and the characteristics of teachers as well as students' influence upon the learning process. Instead, they recommend examining additional elements for defining teaching effectiveness (the mediating variables/factors) between teaching activities and learning outcomes such as the learners' age, gender, ethnicity and subject studied (Lowyck, 1994). On the other

hand, the Hay McBer (2000) report found no correlation amongst biometric data (teacher's age, years of teaching experience, additional responsibilities, qualifications, career history, etc.) and teaching effectiveness. This finding is also consistent with the notion that student progress outcomes are affected more by the teacher's skills and professional characteristics than by factors such as age, qualifications or experience. Hence, the impact of teaching effectiveness is, arguably, contingent upon elements of the situation. The major dispute with process-product research is that while **product** variables (student outcomes or results) can be measured fairly accurately through standardized tests of achievement, **process** variables remain elusive. For that reason, many teacher behaviours and methods of instruction that appear to be effective in one context or milieu may be ineffective in another (Waxman & Walburg, 1991). Effective teachers utilize different qualities under differing situations. They employ different approaches under differing contexts and circumstances – that is to say not one size fits all. House (1991) illustrates this point when he writes, "The good teacher possesses knowledge of what is likely to happen with particular students when certain activities occur …" though it is entirely conceivable that "… the teacher may be wrong in the inferences drawn and the activities initiated" (1991:8-9).

Growing dissatisfaction and frustration with a rather narrow definition of effective teaching and the rise of the cognitive movement during the 1970s, and in particular the work of Albert Bandura (1997), paved the way for an incremental view of the ability perspective that added the teacher's cognitions to the definition of teaching effectiveness. "The most important findings from cognitive research enter the field of teaching effectiveness. The criterion of effectiveness is the cognitive quality of instruction" (Lowyck, 1994:21). Teachers are perceived as capable of thought, reasoning, judgment, decision making, problem solving, planning and diagnosis (Shulman, 2004). Another definition offered by Fuhrmann & Grasha in Centra (1993:44) helps us to understand the cognitive theory approach:

> Effective teaching is demonstrated when instructors use classroom procedures that are compatible with a student's cognitive characteristics, can organize and present information to promote problem solving and original thinking on issues, and can show that

students are able to become more productive thinkers and problem solvers.

Vygotsky's (1978) theory of social constructivism espouses an incremental view of teaching effectiveness by marrying principles of both the cognitive and the humanistic views. Within the classroom, the learners' mind is recognized as important in creating understanding of the material presented in a joint and active collaboration between learners and the teacher. A rich, problem solving, safe and democratic environment where the focus is on exchanging ideas is valued. Effective teachers facilitate learning through a process of guidance to help students become autonomous self-learners who become responsible for their own learning. In addition, excellent teachers are considered those who can ask the right kinds of questions to help students draw their own conclusions, rather than supplying answers. The process itself of gaining knowledge is more valued than the product. As a result, assessment of students is conducted from a number of evaluation methods (observation, students' assignments, and discussions) as opposed to having students provide the correct answers on written tests. Tapping into the learners' personal experiences and placing a greater emphasis on fostering higher-order reasoning skills are some of the most widely reported classroom practices associated with social constructivist theory (Good & Brophy, 2003; Richardson, 1997; Williams & Burden, 1997).

From the above discussion on the evolution towards a definition of teaching effectiveness and from the numerous and readily available definitions of the good teacher, it seems that not one definition is meant to be mutually exclusive nor is it suggested here that there are only personality traits and ability characteristics to be considered. As Cruickshank & Haefele (2001) posit, in an ideal world a good teacher would demonstrate all aspects of teacher "goodness", but in reality, there are many different types of excellent teachers who satisfy the needs of different learners and stakeholders. Cruickshank & Haefele (2001:29) use the argument that "… perceptions of good teachers differ by age, gender, socioeconomic background, educational level, geographic area, and political persuasion". While keeping in mind the mediating factors or variables that may play a major role in defining effective teaching, knowledge accumulated through research covering more than half a

century serves us well in adopting an incremental view of teaching effectiveness that encompasses a large number of indicators found in both the personality and the ability perspectives of the good teacher. Also in agreement with an incremental view of teaching effectiveness is Palmer (1998:4-10) who cautions us as follows:

> Reduce teaching to intellect, and it becomes a cold abstraction; reduce it to emotions, and it becomes narcissistic; reduce it to the spiritual, and it loses its anchor to the world. … Good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher.

A view similar to Palmer's was given to us by Einstein in 1950 when he claimed, "We should take care to not make intellect our god; it has, of course, powerful muscles, but has no personality. It cannot lead; it can only serve" (in Day, 2004: xvii).

Before closing this discussion on the two research perspectives, a closer examination of those attributes assigned to the categories of ability and personality will highlight the complexity faced by researchers dedicated to advancing empirical grounding of what constitutes 'effective teaching'. I reiterate here that my intent is not to imply that teaching excellence can be explained solely and exclusively by means of the personality versus ability perspectives. However, these two dimensions clearly are essential to any thorough examination of teaching effectiveness and as stated above, despite the limitations and controversy surrounding this narrow approach, I have chosen to follow others' methodology to attempt to better understand teaching effectiveness. As Beishuizen *et al.* (2001) point out, "In the course of development of this line of research, several perspectives have been adopted to clarify different characteristics of good teachers. These perspectives can be categorized in two main areas: personality views and ability views on good teachers" (186). However, from Table 2.1 below, which lists the qualities (personality) and the behaviours (ability or skills) of excellent teachers extracted from the researchers reported earlier in this discussion, one can easily observe that some characteristics are maintained by proponents of both constructs. This reinforces that not all human behaviour is binary, nor is it predictable. "Humans are complex beings, with deep-seated and often conflicting needs. Why

we behave in particular ways in our interactions with other people … is not always logical, straightforward or predictable" (Maynard, 2000:29). Some qualities of people are not only difficult to classify, observe and to assess, some also fall under both personality and ability constructs, such as providing constructive feedback, being reflective, insightful and experienced. We can observe these two constructs in Table 2.1, **bold font**.

Table 2.1

Classification of excellent teacher characteristics

	Ability/Skill	Personality Traits
1.	**able to guide**	acknowledge different student needs
2.	**able to influence**	attractive
3.	able to motivate	build good relationships
4.	**able to persuade**	boring
5.	can organize	care
6.	capable of diagnosis	creative/good imagination
7.	capable of judgment	credible
8.	capable of planning	encourage students
9.	capable of problem solving	enjoy students
10.	capable of reasoning	enthusiastic
11.	demonstrate to students they have achieved learning objectives	**experienced**
12.	efficient	fair/honest/consistent
13.	employ relevant objectives	flexible
14.	**experienced**	friendly
15.	**give constructive feedback**	give individual attention
16.	have pedagogical knowledge	**guide**
17.	have social knowledge	hospitable
18.	have tacit knowledge	humorous
19.	**insightful**	**influence**
20.	**lead students to discover**	**initiate/manage/lead**
21.	lectures	**insightful**
22.	match classroom procedures to students' cognitive characteristics	intelligent
23.	makes classes interesting	kind
24.	makes classes fun	make learning interesting
25.	possess content knowledge	motivated
26.	promote critical thinking in students	offer options/choices
27.	**reflective**	open-minded
28.	specify classroom procedures	optimistic
29.	specify student behaviours for successful learning	patient
30.	creates positive learning environment	persuasive
31.	interprets curriculum to establish worthwhile objectives	possess emotional intelligence (EQ)
32.	aligns activities/materials/assessment tools to goals	**provide constructive feedback**
33.	bridge abstract concepts to practical	professional
34.		**reflective**
35.		respectful
36.		self-confident
37.		self-managed
38.		sensitive
39.		serious
40.		show empathy
41.		supportive
42.		teaching style
43.		thirst for self-improvement
44.		trustworthy
45.		understand students
46.		work effectively with others

Thus, while Table 2.1 served as a guide to help me attribute excellent teaching characteristics to either ability or personality categories for the remainder of this thesis, I remain aware that some of these traits, particularly those relating to the personality perspective, are still being debated by the experts in the field and claimed by proponents of both camps. I am also aware that to suggest that all effective teaching traits fall under either personality or ability measures would be a rather narrow view of teaching effectiveness and that other categories or classifications of teaching practices exist and are favourably argued for in the literature. However, for the purpose of this research paper, these two main classifications serve as an embarkation point and I believe, would be fully supported by many of my predecessors.

2.3 General literature on teacher/teaching effectiveness

2.3.1 Introduction

After reviewing the literature specific to teacher development, two broad domains emerged in which to organize the information that was collected and synthesized – in-class characteristics (how the teacher performs in the classroom environment) and out-of-class (external teacher education). Following Cheng *et al.'s* (2001) classification and criteria, in-class characteristics of effective teaching were organized under the headings of (1) Teacher Characteristics or personality traits and (2) Teacher Competence and Teacher Performance – ability measures as outlined earlier in this discussion. Teacher Characteristics included personality traits such as self-concept, efficacy, beliefs and values, and personal views and mission. Cheng *et al.'s* criteria to describe teacher competence included references to cognitive skills, pedagogic knowledge, ethical knowledge, goal setting, language and IT skills, as well as subject knowledge. The label Teacher Performance (behaviour) was used to group classroom management, teaching style, student learning experiences, teacher attitudes, and use of facilities and materials.

The second broad domain which grouped out-of-class or External Teacher Education components included key qualities that, according to the literature (Anderson, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000) , effective teachers should

possess prior to entering the classroom for the first time as well as on-going development throughout their entire career until retirement. Last, it should be kept in mind that the attributes which appear are not ranked in any order of significance: all attributes discussed below are of equal significance to the descriptions of effective teaching in the eyes of the experts reviewed. In addition, this discussion does not claim to capture every characteristic that is required for excellent teaching: the research is on-going and new evidence is appearing continuously.

We shall begin this discussion by examining three characteristics deemed essential to effective teaching according to the literature: competence, performance and the successful employment of teaching strategies.

2.3.2 In-class attributes - competence

The first of three in-class attributes that teachers should possess prior to their initial contact with students in the classroom is competence. According to Anderson (2004), Hay McBer (2000), Borich (2000), Kyriacou (1998), Robertson (1996), Lowman (1995), and Dunne & Wragg (1994), an effective teacher is one who possesses competence in organizational skills such as systematizing materials in logical sequence with a high degree of clarity and presenting those materials in structured, step-by-step procedures. Robertson (1996:82) clarifies the importance of teachers being well prepared and organized by alerting us that unless teachers are able to "… demonstrate at the outset that they are keen to communicate their subjects in a committed and organized manner … it will quickly become evident that their authority has no legitimate basis". If teachers miss this opportunity, students will rapidly lose interest and respect, causing the teacher to resort to wielding power in an autocratic manner in order to maintain classroom order.

Two equally important competencies of the effective teacher are first, the ability to select appropriate objectives from the curriculum and second, to be able to align classroom materials and activities to those objectives (Anderson, 2004; Dunne

& Wragg, 1994). In other words, the effective teacher must be able to help students "… to see the forest as well as the trees" (Anderson, 2004:46).

Time management is another in-class competence that is demonstrated by effective teachers (Anderson, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000; Dunne & Wragg, 1994; Stones, 1992; Chickering & Gamson, 1991). Teachers who make efficient use of class time, who start and end lessons on time, keep non-instructional time to a minimum and allocate time fairly amongst students demonstrate effectiveness to students. The UNESCO report (Anderson, 2004) makes this point clear with the assertion that "The vast majority of an effective teacher's lessons focus on academic purposes" (78). This view is concurrent with Chickering & Gamson's earlier (1991) claim that more time allocated to learning tasks increases students' success rates. According to Stones (1992), teachers' greatest problems arise when the teacher does not allocate sufficient time for students to experience or to integrate the newly learned concepts they are intended to learn with existing ones. Therefore, one can extract from these words that both planning and time management are critical skills to effective teaching and to the prevention of student behavioural problems.

Communication skills such as body language, tone of voice, elocutionary skills, and the ability to listen to what students have to say are other frequently mentioned characteristics of effective teaching (Day, 2004; Anderson, 2004; Robertson, 1996; Lowman, 1995). "In many ways, clear and precise communication lies at the very heart of teacher effectiveness" … while "… poor communication is the most likely cause of students' lament: 'He/She really knows the stuff, but just can't get it across' " (Anderson, 2004:96-97). Elocutionary skills were an important quality of the excellent teacher to Robertson (1996) in particular who connected the qualities of vocal tone, eye contact, concealing of anxiety, and body language with effective classroom communication. Stones (1992:35) also stresses the importance of language as "… the most powerful aid to human learning".

In addition to demonstrating a thorough knowledge of their subject matter (Day, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Lowman, 1995), another teaching competence that is

displayed by effective teachers is the ability to explain complex ideas using simple analogies, examples and metaphors (Lowman, 1995; Dunne & Wragg, 1994; Brookfield, 1990). Lowman's words about effective "… college teachers are those who are able to explain ideas and the connections between them in ways that make eminently good sense to the uninitiated" (1995:22) captures the essence of this characteristic while Brookfield leaves us with the practical application of this important assertion, "Whenever possible, represent complex intellectual ideas or connections between concepts by using analogies and metaphors that are familiar to people" (1990:78).

Another competency that effective teachers illustrate is the ability to assign useful tasks and homework that help students to link to previous and to future lessons and materials (Anderson, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000). "Homework is one of the few variables in international research that has been consistently associated with increases in student achievement" (Anderson, 2004: 102). When it comes to evaluating what students have learned, effective teachers use a wide range of assessment techniques, communicate what criteria will be used for marking and adjust the teaching appropriately, based on student outcomes (Anderson, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000).

2.3.3 In-class attributes – performance

The second in-class attribute that teachers should be prepared for during their teacher training programs is the ability to perform successfully in the classroom. The majority of effective teacher abilities which fall into the category of in-class performance are directly related to how well the teacher manages his/her classroom (Day, 2004; Anderson, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Robertson, 1996; Dunne & Wragg, 1994). Order will prevail in classrooms when clear boundaries, rules and procedures are communicated and established with students. Teachers who maintain control in their classrooms are able to anticipate problems before they happen and thus maintain an organized environment. But equally important to establishing an atmosphere in which effective learning transpires are the psychological and physical

factors such as creating a safe, secure, comfortable and attractive environment. There is considerable overlap between the UNESCO paper (Anderson, 2004), the Hay McBer report (2000) and Dunne & Wragg's work (1994) in how the use of books, equipment, paint, artwork, plants and the displaying of student work all contribute to the reduction of fear arousing factors. Another manner in which to promote a productive environment is how well effective teachers are able to encourage co-operation amongst all students to participate in individual, group and student-to-student learning activities (Hay McBer, 2000; Dunne & Wragg, 1994; Chickering & Gamson, 1991). Furthermore, teachers who are competent at employing a wide repertoire of teaching approaches and activities to cater to diverse learning styles are considered more effective than those who follow just one format of instructional delivery. "The passionate teacher will not only recognize the need for, but will also want to employ a range of approaches that take account of the most up-to-date knowledge of teaching and learning" (Day, 2004:82). This can be interpreted as not one size fits all; multiple approaches to pedagogy are important tools needed to cater to diverse learning styles essential to communicating knowledge effectively to students. Dunne & Wragg summarize the importance of "… arousing and maintaining pupil interest …" through "… attracting initial interest … achieved from different approaches that the teacher might adopt" (1994:23).

One of the most frequently mentioned elements of effective teaching is the ability of teachers to actively engage students in their learning. These include skills such as asking students a lot of questions, effectively listening to their answers, and capitalizing on students' ideas and contributions (Day, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000; Robertson, 1996; Lowman, 1995; Chickering & Gamson, 1991). Robertson (1996) held that excellent teachers exhibited respect for their students by their use of questioning techniques which allowed students to feel that they were contributing to the lesson through a process of mutual respect and mutual enquiry. "Students should always be made to feel that their contributions are acceptable and, if appropriate, valuable" (Robertson, 1996:104). The importance of sophisticated questioning techniques for improved student-teacher communication is further developed in the Anderson (2004) report: "… the use of questions fundamentally changes the nature of communication that occurs in the classroom. Through proper

use of questions, didactic teaching becomes dialogue. Pedantic teaching becomes thoughtful discourse" (117).

Two more characteristics revealed in the literature and categorized under in-class performance ability attributes are the effectiveness of monitoring student progress and giving students prompt, useful, supportive and critical feedback. To keep track of student progress in the classroom, effective teachers employ the "lighthouse effect" (Hay McBer, 2000:14) or what Anderson refers to as "… with-it-ness … constant awareness of everything that is happening in the classroom at all times" (2004:67). Monitoring can be used "… not to just check up on progress but also to arouse and maintain … interest" (Dunne & Wragg, 1994:27).

Thus, according to the literature reviewed, classroom performance hinges upon how well the teacher manages the classroom, creates a conducive learning environment, encourages cooperation, utilizes a wide repertoire of teaching approaches, involves students through effective questioning techniques, monitors their progress and provides supportive, timely feedback.

2.3.4 In-class attributes - strategies

Of the seven in-class teaching strategies synthesized from the literature that effective teachers perform, the one most discussed was the ability of the effective teacher to relate content to real-life applications. The importance of this tactic is well articulated by Fried (in Day, 2004) who cautions, "Unless students are able to see the connection between what they are learning and how they might put such learning to work in a real life context, their motivation to excel will remain uneven at best" (15). It is also imperative for teachers to integrate theory to applications in real-life settings (Day, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Kyriacou, 1998; Robertson, 1996; Stones, 1992). The third strategy is for teachers to build upon students' existing knowledge and to establish links to earlier learning. Stones (1992) warns us against assuming that students are ignorant of the subject being taught. He stresses that it is critical to success for teachers to ascertain and verify the competency levels of the

learners before new concepts are introduced, and for the effective teacher to build upon students' existing knowledge. This demonstrates both consideration for and recognition of the students involved. The fourth classroom strategy employed by effective teachers is the use of good review techniques which help students to connect new materials to prior knowledge. "Connections between lessons enable students to see learning as part of a unified whole rather than as a series of isolated, discrete pieces" (Anderson, 2004:84). The last four tactics to be employed within the classroom are to provide students with practice of newly delivered knowledge (Anderson, 2004 ; Dunne & Wragg, 1994), to hold students accountable for their own learning (Day, 2004), teach various learning strategies such as memorization, mnemonics, flow charts and other organizational strategies (Anderson, 2004), and to assign tasks at or just above students' current knowledge level. Anderson also informs us that "… effective teachers ensure that the work is neither too difficult nor too easy for the students. … A greater (not lesser) element of challenge is predictive of greater time-on-task and higher levels of achievement" (2004:104).

This summarizes what the reviewed literature has to contribute to the in-class abilities that must be demonstrated by effective teachers. Of the 21 discussed ability skills that a teacher must be able to perform in the classroom, seven relate to each of the three main categories of attributes – competence, performance and strategies. Competence in the classroom includes being organized/well-prepared, selecting appropriate objectives, aligning teaching activities to meeting those goals, time management, communication, explaining difficult topics in simple terms, and assigning useful tasks and homework. The seven performance attributes discussed are management of the classroom, creating a positive learning environment, encouraging cooperation amongst students, employing a wide range of strategies and approaches, encouraging student participation, monitoring and providing positive feedback. Strategies that the new teacher must possess prior to their first classroom teaching situation are being able to relate theory to real life and to connect this theory to every day applications, respect the students' existing knowledge, employ effective review techniques, allow students to practice newly acquired skills, hold students accountable for their own learning and employ various learning strategies.

Next to be discussed are the in-class personality characteristics deemed imperative to effective teaching by the current literature.

2.3.5 Teacher characteristics

Two personality characteristics mentioned by most researchers examined in this review are closely related: enthusiasm for the topic (Day, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000; Robertson, 1996; Lowman, 1995; Dunne & Wragg, 1994), and making education interesting (Day, 2004; Borich; 2000; Hay McBer, 2000; Kyriacou, 1998; Robertson, 1996; Stones, 1992). Teachers who can generate excitement through a passionate approach to teaching, are memorable, fun to be with and dedicated are more likely to succeed in transferring learning to their students. In turn, "Students are likely to describe the 'exemplary lecturers' as those who captivate them by sheer intellectual force and motivate them to learn material because it seems a terribly important and exciting thing to do" (Lowman, 1995:35). Fried, in Day (2004) helps those who might feel reluctant to demonstrate this important personality trait in the classroom with these words, "Although not the whole story, passion, uncomfortable as the word may sound, is at the heart of what teaching is or should be" (11). Logic (and experience) would dictate that if a teacher becomes excited about teaching her topic, the students would be predisposed to follow suit, and vice-versa. Stones (1992) helps us to appreciate the importance of the second related trait of making education interesting through exhibiting a strong interest in an almost persuasive manner. He posits that if a teacher does not sincerely convey this enthusiasm and positive subject approach then it is highly unlikely that students will become infected with the positive attitudes and emotions essential for learning to be successful, and the teacher's efforts would come to naught.

Another personality trait frequently mentioned in the literature is the teacher being able to genuinely like his or her students (Day, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Robertson, 1996; Lowman, 1995; Chickering & Gamson, 1991). This characteristic means that effective teachers establish close relationships, are friendly, caring, concerned, helpful, and have empathy for their students. Day (2004) argues the case

for close relationships as an effective means for enhancing students' learning with a convincing statement, "Talk to almost any student about good teachers and you will hear the word 'care'. It is a key construct by which good teachers are identified" (27). To further validate his stance on effective teachers' need to establish close relationships with students, Day (2004) states that "Being close to, rather than distant from learning and the learners ... increases the capacity of teachers to do their job well" (94). Chickering & Gamson (1991) would agree with Day. First on their list of seven good practice principles was to encourage student-faculty contact both in and outside of class as the "… most important factor in student motivation and involvement" (65).

Other personality traits that should be exhibited by teachers to become more effective are demonstrating respect to students, self and others (Day, 2004, Hay McBer, 2000; Lowman, 1995), being flexible both inside as well as outside the classroom (Anderson, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000), being fair, objective and consistent, (Day, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Feldman, 1988), having a good sense of humour and playfulness (Day, 2004; Lowman, 1995), being encouraging by building and supporting students' self-esteem and confidence (Day, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Lowman, 1995), being patient (Day, 2004), accessible and available (Lowman, 1995), intelligent (Lowman, 1995) and setting challenging but clear standards and expectation for students (Hay McBer, 2000; Lowman, 1995; Chickering & Gamson, 1991). Day (2004) coalesces many of the above personality traits with these words: "With a trusting and respectful relationship among students and teachers, everyone's ability to work collaboratively and to take the kind of risks that learning requires is minimized" (15). What remains is to examine some of the major factors that are found beyond the confines of the classroom that also have an impact on teaching effectiveness**.**

2.4 Teacher development

2.4.1 Introduction

Teachers work not only in the classroom, but also outside the classroom. Inevitably there is a need to understand the nature of teacher effectiveness from a broader perspective which examines other out-of-class influences such as external teacher education and professional development. To serve as an entrée into the theory behind teacher development while still focussing on the theme of excellent teaching characteristics, the following discussion will focus on three critical areas of how teachers can move from being good to great. Three of the most germane out-of-class dimensions which, according to the literature, teachers must be prepared for prior to entering the classroom and must continue to develop through their careers, are included here for consideration: critical-reflection, mentoring and professional development. Day (2004) provides the gateway into this discussion when he writes, "… teachers who are passionate about their work possess, prior to their entry into the classroom, considerable self-knowledge and clear sets of values and principles that will guide their actions" (107). Hence, what follows is an attempt to clarify the importance of and the manner in which teachers must learn about themselves before they attempt to make changes in others.

2.4.2 Critical reflection

One teaching quality deemed important by many researchers at least as far back as Dewey (1916) is critical reflection. This position continues to be championed by many today, including Yost *et al.*, (2000) who maintain that "Producing teachers who will engage in critical reflection should be a primary mission of every teacher program" (2000:47). The ultimate aim of this approach would be to develop reflective practitioners who "… subject their everyday professional practice to ongoing critical reflection … both inwards and outwards … to develop [their] awareness of others' viewpoints … and to look to [their] own beliefs, standards and values" (Williams & Burden, 1997:54-57). Yost *et al.* (2000) cite many researchers' views that critical reflection, and especially on consideration

for self-change, leads to the empowerment of beginning teachers, many of whom "… bring understandings into the classroom that need to be adjusted, added to, or completely altered" (Richardson, 1997:7). And it is this acquisition of self-knowledge about one's own feelings that would help to appease Maynard's (2000) caveat that teachers' interactions are not always predictable, as discussed earlier in this literature review.

Our beliefs about teaching are influenced by our early school experiences and this can have a large impact on our professional perspectives (Good & Brophy, 2003; Williams & Burden, 1997). To overcome these psychological barriers and to induce cognitive change in teachers, beliefs must be confronted. Teacher training programs which employ constructivist methodology guide students towards a critical examination of their existing knowledge and beliefs since firmly established beliefs, it is argued, represent barriers to the acceptance of others' viewpoints and consequently to cognitive advancement. Thus the aim of this constructivist approach to teacher development is to "… promote tension and uncertainty …" (Yost *et al.* 2000:42) in student teachers in a non-threatening atmosphere through open dialogue which forces them to externalize their thinking patterns, and ultimately feel safe enough to examine and discover alternative options. "The key to enhancing effectiveness is in working with professional colleagues … . It creates an environment where open discussion of practice is an ordinary rather than extraordinary affair and where teachers are not afraid to examine their own and their colleagues' practice so that all can improve the effectiveness of what they do" (Dunne & Wragg, 1994:32). Bullough & Baughman, in Day (2004) illuminate this approach to changing students' comfort levels and fixed thought patterns when they argue "… for change to stick it must find a place in the teachers' thinking, in their belief systems, and in their habitual ways of acting and interacting within the classroom or grow out of their own thinking" (2004:4). Stated more directly, "… reflection on one's own experiences is the only way to improve one's teaching" (Yost *et al.*, 2000:43). From the standpoint of critical theory, Habermas (1973) examined how the process of self-reflection translates into self-liberalization, attainable when "… that what has previously been unconscious is made in a manner rich in practical consequences …" (23). But he also pragmatically warns us that it

will take more than critical self-reflection to "… destroy the dominating dogmatism of existing institutions …" (16). In other words, if one takes no action, nothing comes to fruition: even Buddha had to leave the shade of the banyan tree to teach novices how they too could attain enlightenment. Hence, the value of critical reflection is analogous to the seed of learning which requires nurturing and hard work by the apprentice to foster both personal and professional growth and to become an essential "… part of the mindset of all teachers who are passionate about teaching" (Day, 2004:119). Critical reflection through the enquiry approach is enhanced as a result of dialogue, research projects, written reflections (especially on critical incidents), group coaching and mentoring (Yost *et al.*, 2000), which we shall examine next.

2.4.3 Mentoring

Mentoring in particular can be effectively employed to have a marked impact on teachers' habitual thinking patterns (DeFord, in Yost *et al.*, 2000). Specific to teacher development, mentoring has been defined by Feiman-Nemser & Beasley (in Richardson, 1997) as "… face-to-face, close-to-the-classroom work on teaching undertaken by a more experienced and a less experienced teacher in order to help the latter develop his or her practice. More specifically we are interested in how experienced teachers can induct novices into the intellectual and practical challenges of reform-minded teaching" (108). Feiman-Nemser & Beasley share the belief that an effective form of mentoring transpires when novices and mentors work collaboratively on meaningful and 'authentic tasks' such as planning classroom activities. According to Stoll, in Fullan & Hargreaves (1992), "It is … the coaching component that appears to have the most significant impact on teacher development" (118). In addition to assisting apprentice teachers to develop their critical reflection abilities, mentors help teachers to "… derive instructional change, depth and flexibility" (Grimmett & Crehan in Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992:56). Zeek *et al.'s* view that mentors play "… a critical role in the success of preservice teachers and professional development schools" (2001:377) is further supported by Carver & Katz (2004) who bring to light the multi-role complexity of student teacher advisors:

"Mentors are looked to as coaches, guides, teachers and cheerleaders … . Their mission is to retain and develop quality new teachers" (450).

But it is not just novices who benefit from this process. Mentors themselves discover various avenues to improve their professional development and to enhance the educational profession largely through the continuous critical reflection processes discussed earlier. Huling & Resta (2001) provide convincing evidence that mentors probably benefit more from teacher mentoring than do their mentees. They state that in addition to mentors refining their reflective practice skills through revisiting their own beliefs on "… teaching, students, learning and teaching as a career" (2001:2), opportunities such as renewing their commitment to the teaching profession are re-energized. Further benefits include psychological ones as mentoring helps them to improve self-esteem, to feel more significant and valued, and provides an avenue to give back to the teaching profession. Collaboration during mentoring processes improves collegiality, leads to the refinement of leadership skills, provides opportunities to participate in research projects, and leads to opportunities to deliver their newly acquired knowledge to different audiences (Huling & Resta, 2001). Fullan & Hargreaves refer to other studies which "… provide further confirmation of the link between staff development, implementation, and student outcomes" (Stallings, in Fullan & Hargreaves; 1992:2). These will be examined next.

2.4.4 Professional development

> Probably nothing within a school has more impact on students in terms of skills development, self-confidence, or classroom behaviour than the personal and professional development of their teachers … . (Barth, in Day, 2004:133)

The third topic to be touched upon in order to broaden the picture of effective teaching relative to out-of-class themes is the emphasis placed on continuous teacher development, described as "… the professional growth a teacher achieves as a result of gaining increased experience and examining his or her teaching systematically" (Glatthorn in Villegas-Reimers, 2003:11). Of interest is how the second part of this

definition ties directly to the earlier discussion on critical reflection. Today there is mounting evidence to link the benefits of continuous teacher professional development with improvement on students' performance and learning outcomes (Villegas-Reimers, 2003; Clair & Adger, 1999; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992). Teacher performance and thus improved student achievement can therefore be argued as being strongly influenced through the employment of professional development programs in which teachers are actively involved rather than just being passive recipients of knowledge. One example of teachers' active involvement is provided by Hay McBer (2000) who suggests that 'star teachers' who have acquired new knowledge and skills can develop those who are lacking or have identified an area for their own improvement. For example, the impact of e-learning, the use of computers in the new wireless classroom, constant change and continual upgrading of instructional and technological techniques will provide exemplary teachers with opportunities to professionally develop their co-workers through on-site or off-site workshops. As discussed earlier with mentoring, it could be reasonably argued that those who deliver professional development workshops also benefit more than the recipients of the new knowledge: as the old adage suggests, the best way to learn something is to teach it. However, unless a supportive environment is in place where both on and off-site learning opportunities are accessible to address teachers' individual and multiple needs, the excitement and enthusiasm central to effective teaching will be:

> … difficult to sustain in schools and departments that themselves do not promote the continuing professional development of all who work in them through, for example, mentoring schemes, regular peer observation, dialogue about teaching and learning, inquiries into practice for the purposes of further understanding and improvement, as well as the more traditional forms of 'in-service' activity" (Day, 2004:143).

As we have seen earlier in this literature review, classroom culture is a major factor impacting students' learning. In order to create and to maintain a safe, supportive classroom culture, teachers need to develop and maintain requisite and constantly evolving skills on a regular basis. And these skills, according to Anderson (2004), are best developed through external courses, workshops and

training seminars, and I would also contend, through the pursuit of higher educational qualifications.

Last to be discussed in this literature review is an examination of relevant research studies devoted to gathering data directly from the point of view of students and teachers on what constitutes effective teaching.

2.5 Introduction to the empirical studies

Empirical studies from around the world which have investigated various categories of student and faculty views of excellent teaching were examined from a range of differing perspectives, and with an emphasis placed upon college/university level teaching. The objective in analyzing the following empirical studies conducted by educational researchers was two-fold. First, do the studies reveal descriptors of effective teaching that are common to all study respondents? Second, does some level of consensus exist, regardless of student or teacher status, age, gender, program level, or culture on the qualities required for teaching excellence? The researchers reviewed below captured sets of features which they deemed critical to the craft of teaching at the highest levels of performance from different continents, perspectives and methodological approaches.

As the literature review progressed, findings were compiled into a table format alongside the 22 characteristics of excellent teaching derived by Feldman (1988) in his exemplar approach (see Appendix 1). Particular emphasis is given to reviewing Feldman's study because it informed the approach taken to my study. Other researchers' findings of student and faculty views of teaching excellence were compared for similarities to Feldman's general instructional dimensions. Characteristics which did not match one of Feldman's descriptors were compiled and analyzed to create additional attributes. Fifty-five supplementary characteristics of excellent teaching were ultimately identified from the secondary analysis. Teacher personality and ability characteristics were differentiated as these represent the conceptual framework adopted for my study. The country of origin of

respondents as well as a mini-descriptor of the target population sampled was also included (grade school, traditional or adult student, and faculty). In addition to the evidence gathered from the researchers, the findings extracted from my exploratory interviews were subsequently included. Appendix 1 therefore serves to consolidate characteristics of teaching excellence in one easy-to-visualize format, purposely engineered to indicate where common features surfaced. Once all characteristics of teaching excellence as reported by researchers were listed in Appendix 1, it ultimately became the starting point for the development of a questionnaire to further my understanding of the traits of teaching excellence from the opinions of participants in my present environment. Let us now attempt to extract from the empirical studies the traits and characteristics considered essential to effective teaching and compare these findings with the literature examined above.

2.5.1 A synthesis of North American studies reflecting similarities in student and faculty perspectives of effective teachers/teaching

In order to ascertain opinions of effective teaching characteristics from both students and faculty across North America, Feldman (1988) conducted a benchmark meta-analysis of 31 separate studies. Each study was independently analyzed to determine "… the differential importance of the various attitudes, behaviors, and practices to effective teaching … for both students and faculty" (Feldman, 1988:292). Results indicated substantial correlation between criteria used by students and faculty in rating teaching effectiveness though by no means did Feldman suggest that their opinions were identical.

Feldman's categorization of 22 instructional categories of effective teachers' attitudes, behaviours, and pedagogical practices were rank-ordered to indicate differences between student and faculty views on each instructional dimension. From his table, one can observe that student respondents in studies conducted in Canada and the United States particularly valued faculty who were interesting, possessed good elocutionary skills, were available and sensitive to students' progress, were well-prepared, possessed good subject knowledge, stimulated interest in the course/subject matter, and exhibited enthusiasm for their subject/towards

teaching. This finding is consistent with results from our earlier discussions (Day, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000; Kyriacou, 1998; Robertson, 1996; Stones, 1992).

From the perspectives of the faculty, the four highest ranking instructional dimensions were: possessing subject knowledge, demonstrating enthusiasm for subject/towards teaching, being sensitive to (caring) students' progress, and being well-prepared. Despite these differences, however, Feldman points out that "… students and faculty were clearly similar in their views about the importance of 13 of the 22 instructional dimensions under study…" (1988:322).

Similarities in how adult students perceive excellent teaching was also observed in subsequent studies by Donaldson (1991) and Ross Gordon (1991) who both based their studies on Feldman's earlier work, and Walls *et al*. (2002) who conducted an independent study more recently. Donaldson advanced the argument that because of the changing demographics of the student population in the United States where older students were combining work and study, it would be of value to extend Feldman's earlier work (1976) which had focused "… almost exclusively on the perceptions of traditional, undergraduate students …" (Donaldson, 1991:60). Ross-Gordon (1991) however, exclusively targeted adult undergraduate students' perceptions of effective teaching, comparing her study findings against Feldman's (1988) top 22 characteristics of effective university teaching (Appendix 1). Her stated objective was to determine "… the extent to which the teaching characteristics judged as most critical by adult students are consistent with predictions based on assumptions about adults as learners previously identified [in Feldman's study] by younger students" (1991:14). Both Ross-Gordon and Donaldson used Feldman's instructional characteristics as a basis for analysis; findings which did not correspond to Feldman's categories were added as additional categories. A comparison of Donaldson's attributes with those reported earlier by Feldman indicated that a "… great deal of similarity was found between characteristics of excellent instruction reported by adult students in this study and the characteristics reported by younger students in the Feldman (1976) study" (Donaldson, 1991:75). More pertinent to this discussion, the findings of the Donaldson (1991) study of

adult students' conceptions of the excellent teacher, particularly the top-ranked items (Appendix 1), continued to demonstrate high consistency with the views of teachers and traditional student perceptions, indicating that even across diverse age groups and over time, common characteristics of excellent teaching do exist. Fourteen (73%) of the 16 items most frequently mentioned in Ross-Gordon's study also appear in Feldman's list (Appendix 1). Her results also appear to further support that adult university students demonstrate comparative uniformity with the perceptions of teaching excellence held by younger college/university students across North America.

This relative consistency over time was also reported by Walls *et al*. (2002) in their study of effective/ineffective teacher characteristics as perceived by novice, beginning and experienced teachers when they state:

> … it appears (a) that perceptions of effective teachers do not change a great deal across the teaching-experience continuum and (b) that emotional climate constitutes a strong, if not predominant, construct associated with effective teaching, as seen by the entire range of prospective to experienced teachers (2002:40).

Walls *et al.* (2002) compared three groups of adults presumably in the eastern United States of America (no clues were offered as to the source of their data) including: prospective teachers entering a university teacher training program, novice teachers just completing the five-year teacher training program, and faculty who possessed first-hand job experience teaching kindergarten through to high school students. They asked participants to: (a) describe their most effective (best) teacher and (b), describe their least effective (worst) teacher. After classifying respondent descriptors into verb-referent statements and applying analysis to their resulting dependent variables, results indicated that there existed almost identical perceptions of both effective and ineffective teachers across all three groups of respondents. Walls *et al.* (2002) also reported that the affective domain (emotional environment or personality) was a prominent feature reflected across all three groups: the good teacher cares about students, is organized, is enthusiastic, involves students, motivates students, manages classroom well, cares about students' success and relies more upon procedural (how to do) knowledge. Conversely, the ineffective

teacher was described as one who creates tension in the classroom, is inept at pedagogy, dislikes teaching, engages in little interaction with students, is intolerant of questions from students, is unreasonable/unfair with assignments/tests/grades, is either a dominant authoritarian or has no classroom control, and last, depends upon declarative (what to do) knowledge. In discussing their findings against the current literature, Walls *et al.* (2002) reported that "expert" teachers did employ more procedural knowledge than did novice or less effective faculty. Another noteworthy observation made by Walls *et al.* was that the "good" teacher was not at all the mirror image of the "bad" teacher, yet when I conducted my initial, exploratory faculty interviews, 50% of the teachers and professors interviewed apparently believed that they were indeed mirror images. This contradiction between Walls *et al*.'s findings and my exploratory investigation opens another door to future research.

Finally, Walls *et al.* advanced the argument that even if all possible descriptors of the effective teacher were somehow captured, this did not necessarily provide the formula for the development of effective teacher training programs. "Simply copying the external characteristic of effective teachers … is likely to result in a conservative mimic lacking in adaptive innovation …" (Walls *et al.*, 2002:46). Of the 16 characteristics of teaching excellence that were extracted from this study, 13 (59%) were consistent with Feldman's top ranked 22. Once again, consistency in the opinions of student teachers, novice teachers, and experienced teachers with those of university and college student opinions has been demonstrated. But how do these study results, limited to North America, compare with research conducted elsewhere?

2.5.2 An analysis of studies from around the globe reflecting similarities in student and faculty perspectives of effective teachers/teaching

Additional studies examining students' and faculty's perspectives of effective teachers from other cultures have revealed similar observations to those discussed above. For example, Miller *et al.* (2001) conducted their study comparing respondents' input from Africa, China and North America. In a separate study,

Beishuizen *et al.* (2001) conducted their research in Holland and compared their results with a similar study conducted in Trinidad and Tobago. Finally, Fernandez & Mateo (1992) examined nearly 200,000 university students' perspectives in Spain. All three studies reported similarities in respondents' opinions of what constitutes effective teaching.

In the preamble to their 2001 study, Miller *et al.* reviewed many international studies on the topic, including studies conducted in Thailand (Poonyakanok, Thisayakorn & Digby in Miller *et al.*, 2001), in Spain by Fernandez & Mateo (1992), in North America by Feldman (1988) and a cross-cultural comparison study comparing teaching effectiveness in British Columbia, Canada and in Israel (Zoller, in Miller *et al.*, 2001). All these studies, according to Miller *et al.* (2001:139) demonstrated a "… high degree of similarity between students' and instructors' beliefs and expectations about teaching". However, like Donaldson (1991) and Ross Gordon (1991), Miller and her colleagues also felt that more information was needed to better understand the impact of student age on faculty evaluations. In their study which examined perspectives of faculty, traditional students (under 25 years of age and entering higher education institutes directly from high school), and adult students in Africa, China, and North America, Miller *et al.* found a "… high degree of similarity between what instructors and students considered important for effective teaching" across all populations in their study (2001:141). They also reported that their findings were consistent with past research, suggesting, as we have noted earlier, that students and teachers in all three diverse populations did indeed use the same criteria when evaluating effective teaching.

Both Beishuizen *et al.* (2001) and Fernandez & Mateo (1992) placed effective teaching under the same two main categories which govern this study: ability (skills, knowledge, teaching experience) and personality (balanced nature of teacher or relational aspect). Beishuizen *et al.* (2001) asked students and both primary and secondary teachers in Holland to describe a good teacher. Their results did reflect that both students and teachers in Holland preferred to describe the good teacher in terms of either ability or skill. After comparisons of age were drawn, primary school students, as distinct from older students or teachers, stressed the

ability view (skills aspect) of teachers as being competent instructors who focused on skills and knowledge transfer. On the other hand, secondary students emphasized the teachers' personality view (relational aspects) as characteristic of good teaching. Similarly, faculty "… displayed an explicit personality view on teachers, both in primary and in secondary education" (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001:196) which indicated agreement with older students but disagreement with primary school children's opinions. This led the researchers to suggest that discrepancies between teacher and student views of excellent teaching tended to diminish as students advanced to higher grades and to higher maturity levels, emphasizing others' claims that adult students' perceptions of effective teaching are valid and thus worthy of consideration.

Fernandez & Mateo (1992) also argued that students were indeed qualified to identify significant domains of effective teaching and that their opinions, which remain relatively constant over time, did correlate to a high degree with others who evaluate teaching. "Others" may be interpreted as administrators, but the study did not directly disclose who the "others" were. Their findings, similar to those just reviewed above, revealed that there were no significant differences as to opinions of what constitutes effective teaching between female and male students, subject area, or even student level in university programs offered in Spain. Their study also did not discuss any perceptions of excellent teaching from the faculty's perspective in Spain. Student respondents were described as falling into two age groups, but no mean age was provided nor did the study offer any possible reasons for differences in opinions based on age groups of respondents. Other studies, however, have revealed differences amongst respondent groups, and we shall examine these next.

2.5.3 An analysis of studies reflecting differences in student only perspectives of effective teachers/teaching

An examination specific to how different age/status student groups evaluate effective teaching is the focus of this next section.

Disparities in how students of different ages/maturity levels were reported in three separate studies. Graduate students in the Donaldson & Flannery (1993) study:

> … were more likely than undergraduates to mention: good role modeling; adaptation to student needs; success of the instructor in motivating students; instructor dedication; the instructor's knowledge level; course organization; personal organization of the instructor; facilitation rather than transmission of knowledge; use of a variety of [teaching] techniques; instructor's encouragement of active learning; instructor openmindedness; and, instructor's warmth (154).

In comparison, older (mature) students (45 years and older) stressed the importance of the teacher's knowledge, dedication and ability to motivate students. This last finding was similar to Witcher *et al.*'s (2001) examination of pre-service teachers' perspectives of effective teachers. Results indicated that the older students in their study endorsed ethicality issues more frequently than did their younger counterparts. Again, older, 'traditional' students in Keller *et al.*'s (1991) study differentiated themselves from younger students when they rated two characteristics of effective teacher behaviour as significantly more important: relating theory to the real world and demonstrating love/enthusiasm for their subject matter. On the other hand, younger students in the Keller *et al.* study tended to rank teachers higher who reviewed materials before giving tests, moved around the classroom a lot while teaching, and who were available to students outside of class. Similarly, younger students in the Donaldson & Flannery (1993) study placed more emphasis upon clear presentations in the classroom than did older learners. These studies bring awareness to the issue of how students might view teaching excellence depending on their age (or life experiences/ maturity levels) and as such was considered when analyzing my own data. These results also yield consistency with previous studies discussed in this section that with experience and maturity, student perspectives of

effective teaching do change over time, as noted in the Beishuizen *et al.* (2001) study discussed above.

Linking these student-only studies in the light of those above which examined both student and faculty perspectives, it can be argued that students' perceptions are considered of value to research. In addition, even though many correlations exist across age groups and even different countries as to how respondents view excellent teachers, differences do persist, thus inviting further research into this topic. To that end, let us examine the perceptions of effective teaching from the viewpoint specific to Arab EFL (English as foreign language) students in an attempt to discover how Arab students' cultural backgrounds could possibly affect this perception.

2.5.4 A general portrait of Arab students

Before attempting any broad, typecast definition of the Arab student, one must keep in mind the immensity of the earth's surface where "Arab" cultures predominate. Spanning south from Yemen to Iraq in the north, and west from Morocco to the Arabian Gulf in the east, considerable cultural, historical and political differences and influences proliferate. Maamouri (1998:7) refers to a UNESCO listing which includes 21 Arab States in the Middle East–North Africa region and organizes these Arab states into two major subgroups:

> (1) the *Machrek* with four subgroups: (a) Egypt and Sudan; (b) Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and Jordan; (c) Iraq and Saudi Arabia, and (d) the Gulf Sates; and (2) the *Maghreb*, which includes … Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya.

Hence, the portrait that follows is not meant to be representative of all Arab students in all "Arab" countries, as this would be like attempting to describe all Europeans by extrapolation information from one or two European countries. In addition, cultural values are changing rapidly all around the world as students travel abroad for their education and as the Internet cuts across all frontiers and borders in an instant. An Arabic saying: "*Kul asabaak mukhtalifa"* which can be translated as

"*All the fingers on your hand are not the same*" succinctly summarizes the above. A quote from Parker in Valdes (1986:94) will also help to make the point:

> Middle Eastern students, whether Arab or non-Arab, Muslim or Christian, share many distinctive characteristics. … Although descriptive primarily of Arab Muslims, they can be considered relevant to Middle East students as a whole … . However, as it is true of most generalizations regarding human society, one should anticipate many exceptions to the "cultural clues" that follow.

To assist the reader to better understand the environment and the student participants in this study, what follows is a general description of some traits extracted from the literature; but readers are again cautioned to bear in mind that one must not judge all by one. What could be a catalyst in the Arab student description, however, is the predominant religion of Arab countries – Islam. Islam and the teaching of the sanctified text in the Arabic language to preserve "… its original purity and unity from any variation …" (Maamouri, 1998: 21) dictates daily behaviours for its followers by laying out rigid rules of life which conforming members must abide by resolutely. Witkins, cited in Farquharson (1989), refers to the Arab culture as a "tight" society. Muslim Arabs' philosophy of life and their highly respectful, paternalistic and extensive authoritative hierarchal society extends to their educational system which stresses replication (Valdes, 1986; Maamouri, 1998). Parker (in Valdes, 1986: 96) expands on this definition of the Arab educational system as one which "… emphasizes an imitative rather than a creative approach to learning; traditionally, students have learned primarily by memorization and imitation …". More than a decade later, Maamouri (1998:21) supported this view of "… the use of a methodology of memorization and rote learning …" as the fundamental reason that "…Arab education is still suffering from this culturally dominant and mimetic pedagogical orientation". These broad statements, however, are perhaps more accurate of a history long past, and are perhaps more specific to how Islam and mathematics were previously taught in schools in the Gulf region, before the discovery of oil modernized society and educational systems.

According to Reid (cited in Farquharson, 1989), Arabs are strong auditory learners. This distinguishing preference suggested by Farquharson (1989: 6) "…

may be a preferred cultural style". Chinn (1987: 6) also cited in Farquharson noted that Arab students were not in favour of disputing, criticizing or contesting ideas from printed materials "… probably because of the idea of sanctity of their preferred text (Holy Koran)". Parker (1986) also makes this point, claiming that the Holy Koran directs followers to not speak badly of people, even those they dislike, but instead demonstrate respect and politeness towards others at all times, particularly in public. This is a characteristic exhibited by Arab students I have worked with over the years in the Middle East, a characteristic that I have come to admire and try to emulate.

Chinn in Farquharson (1989) claimed that Arab students preferred traditional approaches to learning and were adverse to group and pair work. This is in direct contrast, however, with Saafin's (2005) and Raymond's (2001) findings, in which both studies conducted on Arab learners in the United Arab Emirates revealed that the students welcomed learning opportunities where they were allowed to work in small groups or pairs and with Radford's (1980) study which included (Saudi) Arab students learning abroad who also expressed a preference to work in groups. McCabe *et al.'s* recent findings further support the collectivist approach to education by "… the Arab society …" (2008:457) in Lebanon which is also in direct contrast with Chinn's findings.

Farquharson (1989) sees a connection with the "tightness" of the Arab educational system and their dominant learning style to the Arab culture itself. Generally, Arab students correspond to a category of learners which Lowman (1995) described as anxious dependent students characterized as having excessive concern about grades and as wanting to learn exactly what the teacher wants them to learn. Their work is often packed with memorized details and definitions but lacks conceptual complexity. Perhaps the most important need in the eyes of Arab students from their teachers is respect – for themselves, their culture, their country, customs and especially their religion. This point has also been observed by Parker (1986), Radford in her unpublished master's thesis (1980), by Raymond (2001), and by Saafin (2005). Other needs of Arab students, especially those who travel to other cultures and countries for studies, are establishing close relationships with their

teachers who are viewed as mentors for both personal and academic support and guidance (Radford, 1980).

The issue of "respect" is perhaps the one trait within the Arab culture which may most affect a student's attitude and behaviour in the classroom. Direct criticism of students by the authority (teacher) is interpreted as or connected with shame, and subsequently as loss of face in front of others. Patai in Farquharson (1989: 6) tells us that "… the fear of shame represents such an ever-present psychological pressure …" in the classroom. It is suggested that instead of direct criticism, instructors of Arab students should approach delicate issues by telling a story, reading a story or using a cultural assimilator to avoid shaming students directly. Farquharson (1989) stressed that recognizing and appreciating cultural differences will best serve faculty in dealing with Arab students in a constructive manner while an Arab researcher, Saafin, advances a sound argument that "Teacher characteristics and teaching behaviours are enormously important elements in student motivation and learning" (2005:13). Let us now return from this brief attempt to depict Arab students according to the literature, to the description of excellent teaching from the perspective of the Arab learners.

2.5.5 An analysis of studies reflecting Arab EFL student perspectives of effective teachers/teaching

As discussed above, the McCabe *et al.* (2008), Saafin (2005), Raymond (2001) and Radford (1980) studies conducted on Arab learners in Lebanon, the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia revealed that the students welcomed learning opportunities where they were allowed to work in small groups or pairs. Student-teacher relationship was paramount, and the teachers' manners and demonstration of respect were also extremely important to students in the surveys. The excellent teacher was also viewed as one who had sound subject knowledge, presented materials well and employed structured rather than independent learning methodologies.

Other characteristics which appear to be unique to Arab students were extracted from a study comparing adult students' perceptions of good teachers from Canada, China and the United Arab Emirates (Raymond, 2001). Arab students considered the excellent teacher as one who related theory to real-life examples, encouraged students to ask questions, motivated students to learn, allowed group/pair work, and frequently tested student understanding of concepts presented. As with Radford's (1980) study, Saafin's (2005) study participants valued instructors who were open to students' opinions, ideas and discussion. It therefore appears that some traits are common across Arab cultures.

However, after conducting an analysis of current research, Saafin, like many others already reported in this literature review, came to the conclusion that: "…there is no definition of effective teaching that is acceptable by all or most educationalists and practitioners" (2005:58). Borich's (2000:1) definition rings a familiar tone, resonating with Saafin and many others who have been attempting to capture the elusive description of this demanding profession: "Teaching is a complex and difficult task that demands extraordinary abilities. Despite decades of experience and research, one of the most difficult tasks in education today is defining an effective teacher".

> What a fool I was to imagine that I had mastered this occult art – harder to divine than tea leaves and impossible for mortals to do even passably well! (Palmer, 1998:1)

Saafin (2005) presents his findings under two major themes broadly similar to the two central constructs of this thesis: Instructional Skills (or what others would categorize as "Ability") and Human Characteristics (what others have classified as "Personality Traits"). Under the theme of Instructional Skills, Saafin listed four main dimensions which were further divided into categories and subcategories resulting in 53 different Ability traits. Under his Human Characteristics theme, two dimensions were categorized and subcategorized into 28 different personality traits, resulting in a total of 81 separate characteristics of effective teachers from the perspectives of Arab students enrolled in EFL programs at four different higher education institutes in the United Arab Emirates. Transposing what Saafin

unearthed into Appendix 1 reveals 10 traits consistent with Feldman's original 22 (45% consistency). Twenty distinctive attributes were added to Appendix 1.

Appendix 1thus reveals a total of 77 idiosyncratic effective teaching characteristics extracted from the examination of the above 14 studies, and indicates an average consistency of 57% across all studies included in this literature review with Feldman's original list. This result supports the findings of previous studies which claim that perspectives do not always correspond and indicates that research has not yet established a universal consensus on what constitutes effective teaching.

2.6 Summary

This literature review has been purposely focussed, with the primary objective of attempting to establish the current links of what constitutes effective teaching from the perspectives of students, educators and educational researchers. It began with a global view of the general literature then progressively narrowed towards empirical studies focussed only on student and teacher perceptions of effective teaching. Teacher development literature was also examined to determine if the effects of out-of-class issues impacted upon teaching quality. Appendix 1 reveals a long list of attributes that successful teachers must aspire towards. It also reveals 100% agreement across all studies examined in this literature review that an effective teacher is one who is available to help students, and who is enthusiastic for the subject/towards teaching. Links like these are reassuring to those who continue their efforts towards establishing that elusive target of defining an effective teacher. Hay McBer (2000) encouragingly acknowledges to those who might feel overwhelmed by all the demands placed upon their shoulders that teachers can aspire to becoming more effective by achieving 'target levels' in some of the many characteristics that have been raised and discussed in this review.

Though differences have been noted, a general consensus of what it takes to be an effective teacher has been unearthed from the studies and literature examined. In addition, some degree of consistency between what instructors and students consider to be effective teaching traits has become evident. This consistency

appears to cut across respondent status, age, gender, diverse cultures and even across time. However, as Feldman points out, the discovery that some similarities exist between what students and faculty consider essential to effective teaching is only a beginning point. "What really needs to be known is how such similarities or differences come into play in the actual interaction between students and teachers in the classroom. Moreover, do these similarities and dissimilarities affect how well instructors actually teach or how much students learn, and what are the exact mechanisms at work?" (Feldman, 1988:324). It would also be interesting to examine the degree of mutual awareness in similarity or dissimilarity of views between how students and faculty rate effective teaching, and last, whether there is a correlation between which traits are rated highest by students in how they actually rate the effective teacher and how they ranked the traits imposed on them by the questionnaire instrument used in this study. Answers to these questions could shed light upon many avenues to improve teaching practice and leave the way open to future research topics. This current study, however, is intended to add to the corpus of data by investigating student and teacher perceptions of effective/ineffective teaching in a non-Western context.

The early work of Feldman has been referred to in which comparisons have been made and similarities noted, validating the reliability of his pioneering efforts. Furthermore, it has also become apparent that two research constructs of ability versus personality to categorize research findings is a useful and accepted conceptual framework (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Radford, 1980) despite the objections which might be raised by some to this approach. Even though some researchers investigated above still emphasize one construct over the other, the majority saw the two as integrated. As has been pointed out earlier, the ability and traits classification has not been suggested by anyone as an exclusive means of classifying effective teacher traits, nor is that my intention. Despite using different terminology or different organizational schemes, many authors reviewed favour an incremental view where both personality and ability characteristics are essential to describing effective teaching. From the empirical studies included for examination, validation has been established for the argument that students' perspectives of what

constitutes excellent teaching is a valid, accepted and resourceful source of data to research.

It must be pointed out before closing this discussion that because the authors reviewed have different backgrounds and experiences, they will therefore have different interests. Thus, they will subscribe to different methodologies and emphasise what they feel is more critical. To determine effective teaching characteristics, multiple data collection techniques from different research traditions appears to be an established and appropriate approach taken by educational researchers and fully supported by other researchers such as Salomon (1991). What remains to be seen is if results from my study, which has been directly influenced by these researchers and purposely designed to extract the perspectives of both students and teachers at the same institute in a Gulf region as to what constitutes effective teaching, will support or contradict earlier researchers' findings. Findings from my study will be discussed and linked back to this literature review where applicable in Chapter 4. Let us turn to Chapter 3 for a description of the study's methodology and to learn how my approach was fashioned and influenced by these aforementioned scholars.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section first discusses how the empirical studies influenced the planning of the study and ultimately led to the study hypothesis. It outlines the study design and describes the study participants. Then it delineates the research questions to be investigated, describes the interview techniques and explains how the results were employed towards the development of the survey instrument. Last, the collected data and analysis procedures are discussed before concluding with a discussion on the study limitations.

3.2 How the empirical studies informed/influenced the research design

The review of the empirical studies influenced and guided the approach taken to my research in a number of ways. First, it led me to employ a mixed-method approach. As this was my first venture into doctoral level research, I felt the use of both interpretive and scientific paradigms would not only add validity to my results, it might also increase the possibility that my study findings would ultimately reach a wider population if they were published in one of the academic journals. Second, it assisted me in the design and development of the questionnaire, including the use of a four-point Likert scale. Third, it informed my decision to categorize effective teaching traits. Fourth, it raised awareness to how various factors such as age, respondent status, gender and other factors could impact perspectives of respondents' opinions. Fifth, it provided both validation and encouragement to include students' perspectives of effective teaching as a valid and important source of information. Sixth, I learned about and adopted the use of verb-referent statements and last, I included reference to ineffective teachers in my questionnaire instrument as an alternate method to extract comparative data to effective teaching qualities.

Feldman's pioneering work (1988) had perhaps more impact upon my research design than any other study. From a design point of view, what was

particularly strong was the way he quantified his data and ranked student and faculty perspectives with a third column indicating the differences between the two groups on each instructional dimension. As a result, it was decided that when presenting my findings, students' rankings would be listed first, and second, Feldman's findings would be combined with the literature reviews and interview results into meta-themes as an efficient and effective means to present and discuss my findings. The title of his paper was also appealing and as a result my thesis was named following his lead, but amended specific to my needs. However, Feldman's coding of at least two of the instructional dimensions was confusing and as a result both were, for the purpose of this study, re-written in order to relate better to the emerging data.

The use of verb-referent statements to categorize responses was taken from Walls *et al.* (2002) because of the user-friendly, yet simple and encompassing value of the concept. However, Walls *et al.*'s use of "Is enthusiastic" as a verb-referent statement caused me to initially wonder what the researchers meant: is the teacher "enthusiastic" about teaching? the subject? towards students? about life? or all of the above? Thus I learned that when developing my own verb-referent statements, I had to strive to be clear to my readers as to what each verb-referent statement that I categorized actually referred to. As the literature review progressed, verb-referent items extracted from each study in which participants rated effective teachers were combined into a table format (Appendix 1) for comparison against Feldman's (1988) 22 characteristics of excellent teaching. This synthesis resulted in Appendix 1 which formed a basis for comparison of the important teaching qualities in the opinions of respondents examined from as many perspectives as possible. Appendix 1 thus formed the foundation for my questionnaire.

What also emerged and ultimately had considerable impact on the approach taken to my study was the emphasis on two perspectives of the effective teacher adopted by Saafin (2005), Walls *et al.* (2002), Beishuizen *et al.* (2001), Fernandez & Mateo (1992), and Radford (1980). The first view stresses the ability of the good teacher in instructional matters, teaching methodologies, and classroom management. The general assumption in this literature is that the best teacher is the one who has selected and implemented the best instructional methods/strategies/

classroom management techniques to establish a positive classroom environment (Shulman, 2004). The second view of the good teacher is the one that focuses on personality traits. The assumption of this broad literature is that the teacher as a person and the relationship the teacher develops with the students are critical components of effectiveness. Thus, I extracted from the literature review a way to categorize a plethora of effective teacher qualities into two manageable broad categories – personality and ability views. This approach led me to differentiate between the two in order to learn if one was to evolve as more prevalent than the other; it also gave me a basis upon which to compare findings of my own research should one trait should emerge as more predominant.

Another factor influential in the light of the empirical studies was the establishment of a benchmark for comparison against my findings. Previous researchers all argue the validity of student evaluations of teachers and that student opinions appear to be consistent over time (Saafin, 2005; Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Feldman, 1988; Keller *et al.*, 1991). In addition, grade school students, university students of various age groups and experienced teachers from around the globe tended to rate the good teacher in terms of ability and personality traits. Of particular interest is that after reading Saafin's (2005) thesis, complete agreement became apparent across all studies included in this literature review that an effective teacher is one who is available to help students and one who is enthusiastic for the subject/towards teaching. Respect is another important trait revealed by Saafin, as well as being open to students' opinions, ideas and discussion. Of value to my own research is the finding that trait 55 (Appendix 1), "Does group work", appears to be unique to "Arab" populations as all of the research studies included in this literature review that examined Arab students' perspectives specifically reported this finding. However, while Saafin admits that Arab students' "… culture played a role in the shaping of the kind of learning culture that the participants talked about in this study …" (2005:25), a more in-depth description of his student population of "… Emiratis and Arabs from other Arab countries …" (2005:107) would have been beneficial for further research into examining Arab university students living and studying in the U.A.E.

Having taken notice that there are remarkable similarities in how students and faculty rate effective teaching, I also learned from the literature review that many factors such as class size, students' age, and maturity level, class or status level, gender, marital status as well as political and other cultural factors could all possibly have an impact on my study results (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Keller *et al.*, 1991). I therefore remained open in order to recognize differences that might surface between faculty and students based on cultural background, age of student and even program of study when examining and discussing my results.

Also specific to how the literature informed my questionnaire instrument, I deemed the use of the 7-point Likert scale as used by Miller *et al.* (2001) to rate questionnaire items as excessive. I therefore purposely restricted my instrument to 4-points only. This excludes a neutral option since, as we have seen above, all respondents in my survey should arguably have had knowledge of and experience with the topic under study.

The Walls *et al.* (2002) and the Keller *et al.* (1991) manner of asking respondents to describe their most effective and least effective teachers was borrowed for my exploratory study wherein I asked respondents to describe, in their opinion, what constituted effective/good as well as ineffective/poor university teaching. In addition, an open-ended question asking respondents to describe ineffective teachers was included in the questionnaire instrument. The discovery that fully one-half of the respondents in my initial survey expressed that the characteristics of the ineffective teacher were merely the mirror image or opposite of those of effective teachers caused me to reflect upon what Walls *et al.* (2002) said about the two perceptions not being mirror images of each other. Thus, I was prepared to examine this possibility emerging from my data.

One concern which I had with the Keller *et al.* (1991) study was with how they conducted their pilot study and subsequently used this data alone as the basis for their questionnaire. The pilot study was conducted on undergraduate students, asking them two specific questions, "What excites you in the classroom? [and] What

enhances your learning in the classroom?" (Keller *et al.*, 1991:179). The first question, I believe, is inappropriate and highly unlikely to yield the type of responses applicable to teaching excellence. Once the 15 most frequent responses to Keller *et al.*'s (1991) pilot study were identified, these items along with demographic data was sampled on the population. No pilot test was conducted on the questionnaire to verify the quality of the instrument. Hence, the validity of the questionnaire and resulting data, in my opinion, remain questionable and I realized the importance of the developmental phase of the questionnaire instrument.

Finally, reading the Witcher *et al.* (2001) study as well as reflecting back on authors such as Tashakkori & Teddlie (1998), Salomon (1991) and others supported my decision to exploit the advantages of the mixed-methodology approach since it can prove to be an effective method in which to quantify, as well as to qualify, respondents' perceptions of excellent teaching. Further discussion on the "… relative merits of opposing worldviews or belief systems in the social and behavioral sciences…" (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998:1) is to be found in the design of the study section.

3.2.1 A summary of the studies on the excellent teacher

Without repeating each of the 77 characteristics found in Appendix 1 at this point, a durable, well-supported foundation for the development of my own research instrument as well as a solid base of comparison to my findings was established. The consistency with Feldman's original list of 22 characteristics ranged from a high of 86% (Donaldson, 1991) to a low of 23% (Keller *et al.*, 1991) with an average consistency of 57% (Appendix 1).

The characteristics found in Appendix 1 were subsequently ranked in order of frequency mentioned in the empirical studies and are presented below in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1
Characteristics of the excellent teacher extracted from the empirical studies – rank ordered

	Characteristics of excellent teaching	Ranking	*Personality*	Ability
1.	***Is enthusiastic for subject/towards teaching***	1	✓	
2.	***Is available to help students***	1	✓	
3.	***Is concerned with, is friendly to, and respects students***	2	✓	
4.	***Is open to students' opinions, ideas and discussion***	2	✓	
5.	***Stimulates interest in course/subject***	3	✓	
6.	Is prepared, organized	3		✓
7.	Encourages students to think critically	4		✓
8.	Is knowledgeable of subject	4		✓
9.	Explains using simple terms	4		✓
10.	***Is sensitive to and concerned with class level and progress***	5	✓	
11.	***Is fair and impartial in marking/evaluating students***	5	✓	
12.	Provides frequent, prompt, useful feedback	6		✓
13.	***Is dedicated, committed***	7	✓	
14.	Uses relevant course materials	8		✓
15.	Has good elocutionary skills	8		✓
16.	Uses appropriate teaching aids	8		✓
17.	***Has good personality***	8	✓	
18.	***Uses humour***	8	✓	
19.	Creates good learning environment	8		✓
20.	Controls class	8		✓
21.	Possesses intellectual expansiveness and intelligence	9		✓
22.	***Motivates students to do their best; sets high standards***	9	✓	
23.	Uses clear objectives	9		✓
24.	Relates content to real life & other subjects	9		✓
25.	***Encourages independent, self-initiated learning***	10	✓	
26.	Emphasizes outcomes/impact of instruction	10		✓
27.	Uses a variety of teaching techniques/methods	10		✓
28.	***Is strict***	10	✓	
29.	Does group work	10		✓
30.	Is productive in research and professional development	11		✓
31.	***Is patient***	11	✓	
32.	Adapts to meet diverse needs	11		✓
33.	Gives lots of tests	11		✓

	Characteristics of excellent teaching	Ranking	*Personality*	Ability
34.	***Gives credit to students whenever possible***	12	✓	
35.	Answers questions accurately	12		✓
36.	Assignments/requirements clearly defined	12		✓
37.	Encourages students to find their own answers	12		✓
38.	Provides many examples	12		✓
39.	***Encourages student participation***	12	✓	
40.	***Leaves good impression on students***	12	✓	
41.	Reviews before testing	12		✓
42.	Encourages students to answer other students' questions	12		✓
43.	Provides "talk time" in class	12		✓
44.	Gives informative presentations	12		✓
45.	***Treats students as equals***	12	✓	
46.	***Is flexible in scheduling/rescheduling tests and deadlines***	12	✓	
47.	Defines evaluation methods clearly	13		✓
48.	Moves about the classroom	13		✓
49.	Provides outline for each class	13		✓
50.	***Knows students by name***	13	✓	
51.	***Improves students' self-concept***	13	✓	
52.	***Serves as a role model***	13	✓	
53.	Fosters development of a community of learners	13		✓
54.	***Has strong personality***	13	✓	
55.	***Demonstrates leadership***	13	✓	
56.	Is educated and cultured	13		✓
57.	Knows how to teach	13		✓
58.	Teaches with a purpose	13		✓
59.	Has lots of teaching experience	13		✓
60.	Caring for teaching words	13		✓
61.	Willing to repeat explanation	13		✓
62.	(Not) asking students to do things they did not teach	13		✓
63.	(Not) actually teaching	13		✓
64.	(Not) following a lecturing style	13		✓
65.	Checking students' understanding	13		✓
66.	Selecting a diversity of interesting topics	13		✓
67.	Minimizing lecturing time	13		✓

	Characteristics of excellent teaching	Ranking	*Personality*	Ability
68.	Organizing competition in classroom	13		✓
69.	Providing test practice	13		✓
70.	Giving homework	13		✓
71.	Benefited students (sic)	13		✓
72.	Using computer technology	13		✓
73.	Investing the library (sic)	13		✓
74.	Involving students in authentic speaking projects	13		✓
75.	Communicating with students in English	13		✓
76.	Correcting students' speaking mistakes	13		✓
77.	***Smiling at the students***	13	✓	

Notes: 1. Total = 77 characteristics. Ability = 52 (67.5%) ***Personality*** **= 25 (32.5%)**
2. The initial five most important characteristics are personality traits
3. All of Feldman's 22 instructional dimensions are located in the top 27 ranked characteristics

It is important to draw attention to the top two verb-referent statements on the list at this point, "Is enthusiastic for subject/towards teaching", and "Is available to help students". Both are considered as personality characteristics. It should also be noted that all 22 of Feldman's (1988) characteristics placed in this ranked list appear within the top 27 ranked characteristics, validating the robustness of his pioneering work on this topic.

Specific to my own requirements for the next phase of my work, designing an effective questionnaire instrument, two more important factors materialized after constructing and examining Table 3.1. First, even though 77 different characteristics of the excellent teacher have now been categorized and ranked in Table 3.1, I believed that it would not be a good practice to just replicate all 77 items in a Likert four-point scale for the sample population to provide me with their feedback. This number is simply overwhelming and respondents would most likely be unwilling to spend the time that it would require to complete the questionnaire. However, the obvious choice of selecting only the most frequently raised items and eliminating the rest was not considered to be a viable option either. Some of the instructional dimensions listed lower in priority in Table 3.1 were identified as relevant to the

specific milieu in which the study is being conducted, and therefore must also be included. For example, item 29, "Does group work" was found to be an important teaching excellence assessor in the Radford (1980) study of Saudi Arab students, in the Raymond (2001) study of Emirati students, in my exploratory interviews conducted within the study target population, and with Saafin's (2005) current findings. Therefore, this characteristic has earned a defensible position in the questionnaire which was distributed to a predominantly Arab student population.

Second, the personality and ability factors both appeared to be important determinants of the effective teacher, and from this initial review it became apparent that the personality factor was perhaps the more dominant of the two, even though a larger number of characteristics ascribed to the ability category emerged. Therefore, I endeavoured to design my questionnaire instrument to contain a representative number of these two constructs. Through careful consideration of the questionnaire content and layout, perhaps my findings would reveal a preference or a priority in the opinions of my population group. Another possibility was that differences between population groups or in particular between students' and teachers' views as to which of the two constructs - ability or personality - was more important could be disclosed.

3.3 The study hypothesis

As a result of the knowledge gained from the above examination of the literature and based upon my teaching experience in this part of the Gulf region, I hypothesize that student and faculty perceptions of the effective teacher at the university under study will be similar, but that some differences will emerge based upon respondents' age, origins and program of study. Specific to my study population, I further hypothesize that respect, teacher openness, approachability, flexibility and demonstrating that they like their students will be effective teaching characteristics that will emerge as key descriptors of the effective teacher. Last, I put forward the view that students and faculty respondents will describe effective teaching using both ability and personality attributes, but that the personality traits will be ranked higher in priority of the two.

3.4 Design of the study – an overview

A sequential mixed-method approach is becoming more common in research procedures as it allows the strengths of both paradigms to be made complimentary, and thus provides the researcher with greater opportunity of accurately answering the research questions. Considering the mixed method procedure relative to this study, the use of mixed method designs "… is popular with graduate students and novice researchers wishing to use both approaches in their work but not wanting to get into difficulties trying to use the two approaches simultaneously" (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998:46). While taking into account the epistemological issues raised by opponents of the positivist approach to research such as Habermas (1972), others, including more current researchers such as Salomon (1991) argue that the "… complementarily of [qualitative and quantitative research] paradigms is clearly called for" (16) since the weaknesses of one methodology are compensated by the strengths of the other. "As with the case of quantitative and qualitative research in education, cohabitation is not a luxury; it is a necessity if any fruitful outcomes are ever expected to emerge" (Salomon, 1991:17). The use of the qualitative approach of extracting data from representatives of the target population via structured interviews allowed me the liberty of designing the study based on thick descriptions/narratives that were analysed for emerging patterns and salient discoveries specific to the study environment. By using interviews, respondents' true feelings and attitudes would be allowed to emerge, resulting in participants' insights which could lead me to pursue new leads I had not anticipated, or to change direction before I locked myself into the epistemological quantitative process. Thus, based on the qualitative data extracted from the interviews, the construction, pilot testing and ultimate use of a quantitative Likert-scale instrument provided evidence of objectivity to the study, perhaps appeasing opponents to the strictly interpretive approach. Of the many benefits of this tactic, including being able to take a remote stance from the subject under investigation, as well as high reliability and dependability, quantitative data analysis often yields data which can be projected onto a larger population. In addition, results of quantitative research tend to be simple because they are generally reduced to a few numerical statistics and can be succinctly interpreted in a few short sentences as opposed to the qualitative method

of transcribed masses of spoken words. However, this latter approach has the distinct advantage over the quantitative paradigm as the use of the subjects' thick descriptions provide sufficient information to enable readers to judge the applicability of the findings to other studies, or to compare my study setting with ones they are familiar with. A final reason for arguing why the two arguably complementary approaches were employed is that I wanted to develop the best possible instrument to inform the basic question: *What constitutes effective teaching from the perspectives of students and faculty?* The intent was to not only add to the literature findings, but also to provide myself with a tool that could be used in future instructional environments, in other countries, so that I could remain current with and aware of effective teaching attributes that might differ over time and distance. It should also be mentioned here that two open-ended questions were also added to the questionnaire instrument to once again capture qualitative data from the respondents in case the Likert scale instrument content imposed on them failed to capture all the attributes of effective teaching in the eyes of the respondents. Based on a sound line of reasoning such as this, plus the growing evidence in research that exploits the strengths of the two different paradigms to inform and guide the other, a multi-stage mixed-method approach was applied to this study to add external validity to the research approach and accuracy to results.

The first (exploratory) phase consisted of a mode of enquiry similar to a study conducted by Cravens (1996) to examine the responses of students and teachers regarding their perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. The phenomenological method essentially represents an attempt to understand phenomena of teaching effectiveness from the conceptions of those being studied. Phenomenological analyses are inductive and constructive because they require the researcher to bracket or suspend all judgment in order to avoid biasing the analyses (Holliday, 2002):

> *Epoche* helps enable the researcher to investigate the phenomenon from a fresh and open view without prejudgment or imposing meaning too soon. (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:123)

Thus to avoid any a priori assumptions with respect to students' and teachers' conceptions of effective and ineffective teaching characteristics, data was collected from a sample of students and faculty in the English and science departments at the same university where the study was conducted by asking a set of predetermined questions in the same sequence of each interviewee. Standardized interviews are believed to be beneficial when one's main objective is to "… gain comparable data across people …" (Cohen *et al.*, 2000:270). Since this research was primarily concerned with identifying matches and mismatches in students' and faculty's perceptions of effective and ineffective university teaching, the adopted qualitative research methodology was effective in producing descriptive data.

Data collected from the interviews was ultimately used to create verb-referent statements of effective teaching and to help in the design of the rest of the questionnaire instrument. Transcribed and compressed interview results were also included into Appendix 1 as a comparison to other studies conducted around the globe and specific to researchers' results on studies conducted in the Gulf region. In addition, we shall see the interview data employed to help the reader become more familiar with the environment of the study by including appropriate transcripts of the interviews in answering the research questions. The use of the respondents' words help to clarify and emphasize the importance of effective teaching attributes in their opinions.

Interview data was initially drawn upon to generate structured concepts or item pools of what constitutes effective and ineffective teaching from the overall perspectives of the respondents. After careful analysis of the descriptive corpus, emergent categories of verb-referent statements of effective teaching and ineffective teaching were captured. This preliminary work led to the second stage of the data collection process – the construction of a more restrictive, quantifiable questionnaire instrument which was administered to a larger population. The item pools gathered during the interview stage were used as a framework towards the creation of a Likert scale questionnaire which, when married with concepts extracted from contemporary literature, was then administered to a larger population of students and faculty at two different departments in the same university. The use of a questionnaire allowed the

adoption of a more remote stance from the subjects under investigation, thus reducing the possibility that my presence may have an effect on the participants (Bryman, 1992). To add participants' personal comments to the quantitative findings, the third phase of the mixed-methodological approach was to incorporate two open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire to extract an element of qualitative data from respondents.

Finally, after the data from the questionnaire was analyzed using statistical analysis and inferences made, the findings were shared with five students and five faculty members in the English and science departments who were solicited for their thoughts and feedback on the outcomes of the study. The purpose in taking this member check feedback was, as Maykut & Morehouse (1994:147) state, "… very valuable and sometimes helps us see or emphasize something we missed." Members' feedback could lead to other, perhaps alternative, explanations which could guide me to new inferences. This last step gave me more confidence in how the results and findings were interpreted and applied, adding to the internal validity and trustworthiness of the study. It also demonstrated respect to the study participants who were a major factor in making the study materialize.

In summary, this study exploited a multi-method data collection procedure utilizing both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Addressing the multi-method procedure, Cohen *et al.* (2000), as well as Tashakkori & Teddlie's mixed-methodology approach (1998) support the use of more than one method as it explains more fully the complexity of human behaviour if one examines their behaviours from more than one angle. As Patton (1990:14) points out, "Because qualitative and quantitative methods involve differing strengths and weaknesses, they constitute alternative, but not mutually exclusive strategies for research". However, I have also been reminded along this journey that the paradigm war or "… debates over the relative merits of opposing worldviews or belief systems in the social and behavioral sciences …" (Tashakkori & Teddlie 1998:1) is still raging between proponents of one camp or the other. Like Patton, however, I too "… prefer pragmatism to one-sided paradigm allegiance" (Patton, 1990:38).

3.5 Student and faculty demographic data

Profiles of the study participants will be presented first to help the reader better understand the environment in which the study was conducted. Student participants and teachers were solicited from four different programs. Of the 133 participants, 69 were students (52%) and 64 (48%) were faculty members.

The majority (75%) of the 69 students who completed the questionnaire by gender was male (68% of the English students, and 88% of the science students). With respect to first language, 73% of the English students and 72% of science students reported standard Arabic as their first language.

Other mother tongues included Farsi, Urdu, Spanish and Swahili. 45% of students in the English program originated from the Gulf region, 25% were from Asia, and 20.5% were from the Levant region. In comparison, 56% of science students indicated they originated from the Levant area while 20% indicated that they were from Asia. Only 8% of the science students originated from the Gulf, Africa, or from a Western country.

Table 3.2 below provides a summary of student participant demographic data extracted from the questionnaire.

Table 3.2
Student demographic data (N = 69)

Gender						
	M	**%**	**F**	**%**	**N**	**%**
English student	30	**68**	14	**32**	44	**100**
Science student	22	**88**	3	**12**	25	**100**
				Total	**69**	

First language								
	English	**%**	**Arabic**	**%**	**Other**	**%**	**N**	**%**
English student	1	**2**	32	**73**	11	**25**	44	**100**
Science student	3	**12**	18	**72**	4	**16**	25	**100**
						Total	**69**	

Geographic region												
	Gulf	**%**	**Levant**	**%**	**Africa**	**%**	**Asia**	**%**	**Western**	**%**	**N**	**%**
English student	20	**45**	9	**20.5**	3	**6.8**	11	**25**	1	**2.3**	44	**100**
Science student	2	**8**	14	**56**	2	**8**	5	**20**	2	**8**	25	**100**
										Total	**69**	

Demographic information extracted from the returned questionnaires such as academic discipline, gender, first language and geographic origin (nationality) of participants is imperative to discuss at this point. Table 3.3 below provides detailed information needed for the reader to better comprehend terms used in the classification of geographic regions. For the purpose of categorizing both student and faculty respondents, nationalities were grouped as follows:

1. Gulf – U.A.E., Saudi Arabia, Oman, Yemen, Kuwait and Bahrain.
2. Levant – Syria, Jordan, Palestine, Lebanon, Iraq.
3. Africa – Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, Gambia, Somalia, Kenya.
4. Asian – Iran, Pakistan, India.
5. Western – Canada, U.S.A., New Zealand, Australia, Britain, Ireland.

Table 3.3
Student demographic data - Nationality (N = 69)

English Students		Science Students	
Nationality	**N**	**Nationality**	**N**
Iranian	11	Palestinian	7
Emirate	8	Jordanian	6
Saudi	4	Iranian	3
Palestinian	4	American	2
Omani	3	Iraqi	1
Yemeni	3	Pakistani	1
Jordanian	3	Indian	1
Libyan	1	Egyptian	1
Kuwaiti	1	Canadian	1
Bahraini	1	Emirate	1
Gambian	1	Kenyan	1
Pakistani	1	**Total**	**25**
Lebanese	1		
Somalian	1	**Total of student participants = 69**	
Syrian	1		
Total	**44**		

Table 3.3 above reveals not only a diversity of nationalities in the study student population (21 different countries), but also a disparity in numbers of students from these different countries. These groupings were initially applied prior to analyzing the information statistically to determine significant differences occurring between dependent variables (personality and ability measures) and independent variables (participant type, gender, first language and nationality). However, once the data results appeared, it became evident that because of the disparate numbers being compared, an excessively significant association occurred when attempting to examine the mediating factor of nationality, potentially threatening the validity of other mediating factor associations. By careful examination of Tables 3.2 and 3.3 above, one can see that even after attempting to cluster different nationalities under groups, when sample sizes are small as was the case in my study (total participants of 133), small numbers in one grouping can lead to distorted results. Furthermore, claiming that Canadians and Irish were the same culturally caused me to abort making what initially seemed a logical attempt to tie participants' perceptions of excellent teaching characteristics to nationality. It should be understood, however, that the term "Western" was originally chosen to clump the six different nationalities together since that term (as well as Asian, African, etc.) is used throughout the Gulf region for classification of the expatriate

work force. It was not my intent to assert that Egyptians are culturally the same as Kenyans, nor British the same as Americans.

Table 3.4 below provides a summary of faculty participant demographic data extracted from Part A of the questionnaire.

Table 3.4
Faculty demographic data (N = 64)

Gender

	M	%	F	%	N	%
English faculty	15	**42**	21	**58**	36	**100**
Science faculty	23	**82**	5	**18**	28	**100**
				Total	**64**	

First language

	English	%	Arabic	%	Other	%	N	%
English faculty	34	**94.5**	2	**5.5**	0	**0**	36	**100**
Science faculty	26	**93**	2	**7**	0	**0**	28	**100**
						Total	**64**	

Geographic region

	Gulf	%	Levant	%	Africa	%	Asia	%	Western	%	N	%
English faculty	0	**0**	0	**0**	0	**0**	1	**2.8**	35	**97.2**	36	**100**
Science faculty	0	**0**	1	**3.5**	0	**0**	1	**3.5**	26	**93**	28	**100**
										Total	**64**	

The majority of the English faculty was female (58%) while in contrast, female science faculty constituted a minority of 18%. With respect to first language, 94.5% of the English faculty and 93% of the science faculty indicated English as their first language. 97.2% of English faculty originated from Western countries while 93% of the science faculty indicated their origins to be from Western countries. (See discussion above on the use of the classification term "Western".) Table 3.5 below provides further evidence that due to the unequal numbers in groupings, nationality was dropped as a mediating factor.

Table 3.5
Faculty demographic data - Nationality (N = 64)

English Faculty		Science Faculty	
Nationality	**N**	**Nationality**	**N**
American	16	Canadian	8
British	10	British	8
Canadian	6	American	6
New Zealander	2	Irish	2
Australian	1	Syrian	1
Tunisian	1	Australian	1
Total	**36**	New Zealander	1
		Indian	1
Total of faculty participants = 64		**Total**	**28**

This concludes the discussion on the student and faculty respondents and explains why nationality was excluded from the statistical analysis report. Let us now review the research questions which guide this study before discussing the specific details of the methodology.

3.6 Research questions

The major objective of this study was to investigate the extent to which four population groups in a non-Western environment (English students, science students, English faculty, and science faculty) used similar descriptors of the effective/ineffective teacher. The goal was not to arrive at an all-inclusive description of the excellent teacher/effective teaching. Rather it was to make a comparison of findings from my study conducted in a predominately Arab student population to elucidate both students' and faculty's opinions of what constitutes effective teaching against the current literature with the over-riding aim of improving practice. As discussed above, the design and construction of this study was influenced by previous research (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Raymond, 2001; Feldman, 1988; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Keller *et al.*, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Radford, 1980). Based upon these earlier efforts, this study was formulated so that comparisons could be made against their research to my findings "… in order to check their validity from the standpoint of compatibility with accepted knowledge" (Mouly, in Cohen *et al.*, 2002:5) and hopefully contribute

new information to this knowledge pool. This study therefore set out to address the following research questions:

1. What are the predominant characteristics used by the study participants to describe excellent teaching?

2. To what extent are student perceptions of **effective** teaching similar to those of faculty?

3. To what extent are student perceptions of **ineffective** teaching similar to those of faculty?

4. Are the descriptors used to describe effective teaching amongst the four population groups focused more on the ability or on the personality view?

5. To what extent do mediating factors such as academic discipline and participants' gender have an effect on the portrait of the excellent teacher?

3.7 Deciding upon appropriate instrumentation

3.7.1 An overview

The research design and approach was based on a mixture of research methods or triangulation. "Even in a small study, a mixture of methods can often be adopted. … Such a view therefore implies that qualitative and quantitative methods can exist side by side in an enquiry" (Wellington, 1996:17). First, interviews were conducted with random samples from each of the targeted population groups. Once this qualitative data was examined to extract conceptual items, a Likert-type questionnaire was designed and subsequently piloted on a few participants from each of the four population groups. In addition, open-ended questions were also added to the questionnaire and after an editing phase, a final version of the questionnaire instrument was administered to the four population groups. Last, after

the findings were analyzed using qualitative and quantitative statistical procedures, findings were presented for feedback to some of the original study participants.

3.7.2 The research design

Due to the lack of a replicable instrument to extract data on the subject of effective/ineffective teaching characteristics specific to a university setting in the Middle East, it was necessary to devise and field test an original instrument for the purpose of this study. An important concern of this research was the identification of an appropriate data collection instrument. Since virtually all the empirical studies reviewed in the literature had used some type of questionnaire instrument for data collection, it was concluded that a questionnaire would be an appropriate tool to extract the data needed to answer the majority of the research questions. A structured response section of the survey imposed upon the respondents pre-set characteristics for their consideration and rating whilst the non-structured, open-ended response section allowed respondents the liberty to express their own characteristics or qualities associated with excellent teaching. Except for differing demographic data between students and faculty (Part A), the same questionnaire was administered to all four populations surveyed for ease of data analysis, comparison and interpretation. Furthermore, since English was the medium of instruction in all university classes, only an English version of the questionnaire was administered to all respondents.

3.8 Data collection procedures

Data was collected over the course of ten months from May 2005 to February 2006 at a university in the United Arab Emirates using three different collection methods. Each of the three diverse collection techniques is explained in further detail below.

3.8.1 Interviews

For the initial stage, ten participants from each of the four distinct groups described above were solicited by email on a first replied, first selected basis. The volunteers were invited to participate by replying with convenient times when we could set a meeting for them to answer the three exploratory questions. The email explained the study objectives, the procedure and the types of instruments used to collect the data, and ended with a request for volunteers to reply within one week if interested in participating. The task of answering the three open-ended questions for the initial stage of the study was subsequently completed by 40 participants. Hence, the first set of data was collected through structured and tape-recorded interviews with twenty students and twenty faculty members. The purpose of this exercise was to form a foundation to develop a more readily quantifiable data gathering instrument. Another purpose was to gather data from the target population that could be used to advantage when analysing and reporting the findings of this study. Ten students from the English department and ten science students were individually interviewed at their convenience and were asked the three following questions (Appendix 2):

1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching?
2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching?
3. Twenty years from now, what do you think you will remember the most from your best university teachers/professors?

The participants were assured that their responses would be kept anonymous and all interviews were recorded. Participants were also asked to not reveal any names of teachers during the interview. They were instructed that they could answer the questions as succinctly or as descriptively as they wished. There were no restrictions placed on the length of their responses. In addition, students were asked to provide demographic data such as gender, first language, nationality, program of study, and for science students, their current year in their major.

Similarly, the ten English faculty and the ten science faculty were asked the following three questions (Appendix 3):

1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching?

2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching?

3. Twenty years from now, what do you hope your students will remember the most about your teaching?

Anonymity of responses was assured and demographic data for faculty was recorded as follows: gender, nationality, native language, number of years teaching, and professional qualifications. Faculty members were also reminded that there were no maximum or minimum restrictions placed on their responses. They were encouraged to describe the most important points which they associated with effective and ineffective teaching.

Outcomes from the interviews were then integrated with the results of the literature reviews, resulting in the first draft of a questionnaire. Two versions of the questionnaire were created – one for faculty and another for students – completely identical except for the demographic data section in Part A of the questionnaire. Questionnaire items designed to assess respondents' opinions relative to personality and ability characteristics of excellent teaching were deliberately randomized (see Appendix 11) to avoid established patterns being detected.

3.8.2 Pilot testing

In order to ensure the validity of this method of investigation, a questionnaire written in English was piloted on students and faculty from each of the four different population groups. English was chosen as it is the language of instruction at the university where the study was conducted. As Cohen *et al.* (2000:260) state:

"It bears repeating that the wording of questionnaires is of paramount importance and that pretesting is crucial to its success."

There were at least four reasons for conducting pilot testing of the questionnaire. First and most importantly, all questionnaire items had to be tested for clarity of writing. This was essential since student participants were predominantly (94%) non-native English speakers and all questions had to be written using language they could understand, yet at the same time effective in communicating meaningful characteristics they could relate to and answer accordingly. Therefore, any ambiguity had to be identified and appropriately amended. In addition, it was imperative to identify and re-construct any items that might have caused confusion to the target population. The second reason for piloting the questionnaire was to identify any potential items that would not yield useful data. Third, it was important to have participants' feedback on their impressions of the overall layout of the instrument and last, it was necessary to note and record the average amount of time participants required to complete all three sections of the data gathering instrument. As a result of taking these precautionary measures, some surprising and very useful feedback was received, substantial adjustments to the original design were made, and a more robust and reliable test instrument resulted.

The first pilot test (Appendix 8) was conducted on three colleagues in the English department who were told that this questionnaire was to be used with both students and faculty. I deemed experienced English teachers best to critique the language level and clarity used in the questionnaire items. As a result of this initial step, the most significant change was made; the removal of a neutral option from the five-point Likert scale. Feedback in the form of objections suggested that an "Undecided" neutral option was not only disruptive to the thought process of the respondents, it was also unnecessary and perhaps could even cause respondents to be less considerate in the choice of selections. Even though "… the categories need to … exhaust the range of possible responses which respondents may wish to give" (Cohen *et al.*, 2000:253), the inclusion of an "Undecided" or "No opinion" option was considered to be detrimental to the quality of data gathered since it could be

argued that all respondents – students and faculty alike – would have had many years of first-hand experience evaluating and rating effective and ineffective teachers. Thus, the neutral opinion was eliminated.

Also relating to the Likert scale, feedback suggested that the term "Least" important should be replaced with the term "Not" important as it represented the direct opposite of the term "Very" important. In addition, it was also recommended that the scale order be reversed from "Not important" to "Very Important" to follow standard statistical analysis procedures. This was rectified in the second version. Other feedback resulted in re-writing many questionnaire items. For example, questionnaire item 1, Excellent teachers/professors "… are flexible." and item 10. "…are strict." both generated questions from respondents: "Are flexible with what?" and "Are strict with what?" Item one was eventually replaced completely and "Is strict" was rewritten as "… maintain strict control over the class." Other items were re-written using synonyms that students would more easily be able to interpret.

The second pilot test (Appendix 7) was given to three former students as well as two faculty members of the English department who had not been solicited earlier. There were no comments about or objections made to the revised Likert scale. However, section C of the questionnaire was reworded from "In your opinion …" to "In your own words …". One faculty member pointed out that respondents would likely be confused and might wonder if she/he should respond by using one or more of the 25-items on the list found in section B of the questionnaire, or should use her/his own words to answer these two questions. Student feedback resulted in more changes to the 25 items in Part B. For example, question 9 was re-written in a much simpler manner using fewer words and other questions were restructured and had redundant text removed.

For the final pilot testing, students and faculty members from the science department were asked for their feedback and reactions to the instrument. As with the previous two pilot tests, time taken to complete the questionnaire was observed and recorded so that an average time could be calculated and communicated to respondents once the final instrument was circulated. One science student objected

to the term “lecture” and suggested “talk” should be used for item #13; however, this was rejected as it would detract from the purpose of the question so a compromise was made by adding the word “talk” in brackets next to the word “lecture”. Another student’s comments led to the rewriting of an additional three questions for clarity in the final version (Appendix 9). Feedback from faculty resulted in changes to the demographic data; “Associate Professor” was added to the teaching rank. Objections to the use of the term “teacher/professor” in the questionnaire by the science department faculty resulted in re-wording to “instructor/professor” (Appendix 10). Finally, two open-ended questions were purposely added to both versions of the questionnaire (student and faculty) to allow respondents to add their own opinions of effective and ineffective teachers, using their own words:

> The open-ended question is a very attractive device for smaller scale research or for those sections of a questionnaire that invite an honest, personal comment from the respondents in addition to ticking numbers and boxes. … It is the open-ended responses that might contain the ‘gems’ of information that otherwise might not have been caught in the questionnaire. (Cohen *et al.*, 2000:255)

The final versions, Appendices 9 and 10, *Characteristics of Teaching Effectiveness*, were administered to two different student population groups and two different faculty population groups respectively.

3.8.3 Consent

In order to obtain permission to conduct the study, all participants were required to sign a consent form issued by the university under study (Appendix 12). This form included information such as a short description of my study and its purpose and goals. In addition, it informed participants that they were not obliged to participate in this study, that they had the right to withdraw from it at any time, and that their anonymity would be protected. Because student participants were primarily non-native speakers of English, I felt that the English legal terms used on the consent form may have discouraged many students from wanting to complete the survey instrument, thus resulting in a lower return rate. Fortunately, I had the option of using the Exeter University consent form which was less intimidating but also

required participants' signatures (Appendix 13). Finally, approval information and contact details were added to the final versions of both student and faculty questionnaires before being distributed to the four target population groups.

3.8.4 Distribution of questionnaire and data collection

After approval was granted, the heads of both the English and the science departments were contacted. A subsequent meeting was held in order to explain the study and to obtain permission to distribute the questionnaire. The directors expressed interest in the study and agreed to send out an email on my behalf inviting faculty to participate in the study. In addition to soliciting teaching faculty for participating in the study, the email also requested the help of teacher volunteers to distribute the questionnaire to student volunteers in their classes.

All student participants were administered the questionnaire (Appendix 9) during class sessions with the aid of three English and two science colleagues. Students were asked to rate the level of importance on 25 statements from a Not Important to a Very Important four-point Likert scale. The questionnaire also extracted students' demographic data such as their gender, age, nationality, native language, as well as year and program of study. In addition, free-hand data was solicited in the questionnaire by the inclusion of two open-ended questions.

The university faculty respondents (excluding those who had participated in the pilot study) were each hand-delivered a hard-copy of the questionnaire (Appendix 10) along with a cover letter containing instructions (Appendix 14). Participants were asked to complete the instrument and to return it via internal mail within one week. A follow-up email reminder was sent, giving an extension of an additional week to complete the questionnaire. The faculty questionnaire was identical to the students' in every aspect except for the demographic portion which also asked faculty to indicate their years of teaching experience and university rank.

3.9 Data Analysis Procedures

3.9.1 Interviews

For the initial stage of the study, the 40-tape recorded interviews were transcribed. (See Appendix 4 for a sample of transcriptions.) Separate lists of conceptual items for effective teaching and ineffective teaching were extracted. The descriptors extracted from the 40 interviews were first sorted into conceptual items based on Walls *et al.'s* verb-referent methodology (2002). A conceptual item consisted of a verb followed by that verb's referent. Examples of these verb-referent statements are: *Is enthusiastic*; *Respects students*; *Is inaccessible*; I*s disrespectful to students*, and so on. When a verb was associated with two or more descriptors, each statement was scored separately. For example, the statement "*The teacher is fair and honest*" was written as "*Is fair*" and "*Is honest*". Additionally, these resulting 493 verb-referent statements (phrases) were categorized into effective and ineffective teaching characteristics for each group of respondents.

The statements were entered into MS Word with a separate worksheet assigned to effective teaching characteristics and another, separate worksheet for ineffective teaching characteristics. The worksheets were then arranged into columns dedicated to each of the four respondent groups (English students, science students, English faculty, and science faculty) and counts were entered accordingly. Next, MS Word was employed to perform counts on each statement and row counts were summed for both spreadsheets. Once the total sums of each verb-referent statement were computed, the software was used to sort all statements in descending order of sums. The next logical step was to insert a sum of the verb-referents made by each individual population group, as well as the total sum of all verb-referent statements provided by the entire population sample into each worksheet.

A total of 316 statements for effective teaching descriptors (Appendix 5) and 177 statements for ineffective teaching descriptors (Appendix 6) were deduced from the corpus of data emerging from the transcribed interviews. The purpose of question number three was to elicit the most important characteristics of the excellent teacher from both sub-groups using different wording. Data extracted

from the third question which asked students, "*Twenty years from now, what do you think you will remember the most from your best university teachers/professors?*" were placed under the major heading of "Effective teaching" on the chart in each appropriate category of respondent. Similarly, data extracted from the third question asked of faculty, "*Twenty years from now, what do you hope your students will remember the most about your teaching?*" were also placed into the major heading of "Effective teaching" characteristics.

The verb-referent method was an effective means for reducing a large corpus of data into manageable statements. However, there was the possibility that the choice of verb synonyms might not accurately reflect what the original respondent articulated. To minimize this threat, an associate was solicited to independently verify my lists of verb-referent statements. Both of our lists were identical except for disagreement of opinion in three cases. After discussing the discrepancy, we realized that the lexical items in question had been listed as synonyms of the same concepts, so mutual synonyms were agreed upon and the difference of opinion was resolved, resulting in 20 effective teaching verb-referent statements (Appendix 5) and 22 ineffective verb-referents (Appendix 6).

Subsequently, my associate and I independently rated each of the verb-referent statements relative to the teacher as either A (ability perspective) or P (personality perspective). There was complete agreement on our ratings which were then entered into the spreadsheet and tallied. This formed the basis of a questionnaire design which was merged with additional concepts emerging from the literature review.

3.9.2 Questionnaire

As this study made use of a sample of convenience, 50 questionnaires were distributed to each of the four population groups. 36 were returned by the English faculty, 44 by English students, 28 by science faculty and 25 by science students (Appendix 18). Thus 133 of a possible 200 questionnaires were returned, resulting in a return rate of 66.5%.

Upon their return, all questionnaires were examined for usability and then grouped as per sample population. Coding was applied to the demographic data as indicated in Table 3.6 below.

Table 3.6
Demographic coding

Variable	Code	Label
1. Academic discipline	1	English faculty
	2	Science faculty
	3	English student
	4	Science student
2. Gender	1	Masculine
	2	Feminine
3. First language	1	English
	2	Arabic
	3	Other
4. Geographic region*	1	Gulf
	2	Levant
	3	African
	4	Asian
	5	Western

***Note**: See earlier discussion on nationality groupings.

After coding was applied, the demographic data was entered into SPSS, version 13 as a foundation for the questionnaire data obtained from questions 1 to 25. The demographic data was then extracted from SPSS and converted into Microsoft Word 2003 to create a demographic sample distribution by participant type (Appendix 18). Appendix 19 synthesizes the student and faculty demographic data, listing frequencies and appropriate percentages of total population against four independent variables of academic discipline, gender, first language and geographic region.

Next, results from questionnaire items 1 – 25 were entered into SPSS software. To assist in understanding the averages of the Likert scale ratings imposed on respondents while answering the 25 questionnaire items, the true limits of each rating on the scale must be considered as follows:

1	Not Important (NI):	the average true limits are 1.00 to 1.49
2	Somewhat Important (SI):	the average true limits are 1.50 to 2.49
3	Important (I):	the average true limits are 2.50 to 3.49
4	Very Important (VI):	the average true limits are 3.50 to 4.00.

Presenting this scale is of benefit in understanding the results since all judgments and comparisons are based upon it. Means, ranks, standard deviations and minimum/maximum counts were derived for each individual question. This data was then manually collapsed and average rating comparisons were made between how the four population groups rated personality and ability measures. These overall rankings are given in Appendix 19. Appendices 20 to 29 present comparisons of how the various groups rated the importance of the 25-questionnaire items. Means and rankings are provided and differences are noted. How the various groups rated personality traits were compared to each other as follows: English students to science students; English faculty to science faculty; English students to English faculty; science students to science faculty, and last, students were compared to faculty. Ability characteristics were then compared following the same sequence listed above. To assist the reader in interpreting the comparison tables, Appendix 20 compares how English students and science students rated, on average, the personality measures of excellent teaching. For example, question #12 (… are respectful of their students) was ranked as the third most important characteristic of the excellent teacher by the English students, while science students on average ranked this as their most important personality trait of the excellent teacher. The mean difference of (minus) - .14 indicates that the English students ranked question number 12 as less important than did science students.

The next step was to run Chi square tests of the dependent variables in sets of personality and ability measures against the mediating factors (independent variables) of gender, and academic discipline to find out if consistency in ratings

existed. Where significant associations occurred (less than 0.05), probabilities (p) were indicated with an asterisk (*). See Appendices 30 and 31 for personality and ability chi square results.

Tables presented in Chapter 4 were created to help the reader better understand the results of the study. The following statistical abbreviations and terms were used:

- Min: helps in understanding the overall lowest rating given by the respondents on that item.
- Max: helps in understanding the overall highest rating given by the respondents on the same item.
- Mean: represents the responses' average on that item.
- SD: represents the standard deviation for the sample distribution on that item.
- Rate: indicates the judgment on the item as to whether it is Not Important (NI), Somewhat Important (SI), Important (I), or Very Important (VI).
- Rank: orders the items in descending importance based on the item mean.

3.9.3 Questionnaire qualitative data analysis (Part C)

Part C of the questionnaire included two open-ended questions asking participants to describe, using their own words, the most important characteristics of the excellent university instructor/professor, and second, to describe in their own words the most striking characteristics of the ineffective/worst university instructor/professor. Verb-referent statements were extracted from each of the four different groups of the sample population (English students, science students, English faculty and science faculty) and MS Word worksheets were created to record each emergent characteristic. Totals were calculated and ability versus personality characteristics were differentiated for both effective and ineffective characteristics (Appendix 15).

Effective teacher qualities resulted in a total of 363 verb-referent statements which were classified under 46 different characteristics. Ineffective teacher characteristics resulted in a total of 34 different descriptors captured from 333 verb-referent statements. These emerging characteristics were worded as closely as possible to match the original verb-referent statements as employed in Appendix 1.

Next, for consistency and for ease of comparison, all the characteristics of the excellent teacher extracted from question 1 of the Part C freehand data was compared to the characteristics listed in Appendix 1 (excellent teacher characteristics meta-themes as extracted from Feldman's work, the literature review and the initial exploratory interviews conducted for this thesis). To do this, and in order to match the terms used by Feldman and others found in Appendix 1 for ease of comparison, some of the 46 verb-referent statements of excellent teachers from Part C data found in Appendix 16 were condensed, resulting in 28 characteristics more closely matching Feldman's and other researchers' terms. An example of this condensing is Feldman's single characteristic "Is concerned with, is friendly to, and respects students". Four separate verb-referent statements found in Appendix 16 were combined to match this broad characteristic: "Is friendly to students", "Cares about students' learning", "Respects students" and "Is approachable/is available". Hence, the identical data management procedure consisting of verb-referent statements and categorizing classification was employed as had been applied to the exploratory interviews analysis as discussed above. Sums were calculated for each of the characteristics that were represented, and last, meta-themes emerging from Part C data question 1 were ranked (Appendix 16). If no verb-referent characteristic emerged from Part C to match one of those in the original Appendix 1, that characteristic was deleted from the table, resulting in a total of 28 of the 77 characteristics found in Appendix 1.

3.10 Limitations and assumptions

This section addresses the study's limitations and assumptions. These factors must be considered when interpreting the results.

3.10.1 Limitations

Limitations are potential threats to the external and internal validity of the study. Validity is a defendable argument to verify that the research methods used are accurate:

> Internal validity seeks to demonstrate that the explanation of a particular event, issue or set of data which a piece of research provides can actually be sustained by the data … . External validity refers to the degree to which the results can be generalized to a wider population, cases or situations (Cohen *et al.*, 2000:107-109).

Arguably, researcher's contamination effects could have had an influence on the data gathered during the initial, qualitative interviews. In qualitative research, the researcher is regarded as a human tool or as an instrument of data gathering. When conducting face-to-face interviews, existing relationships with interviewees could have an impact on the data collected from them. However, in order to reduce possible contamination effects, two separate precautionary measures were observed. First, no one who was interviewed in the qualitative portion of my sample interview was given a questionnaire to complete. Second, not one participant who helped with the piloting and refinement of the survey instrument itself was given a final instrument for completion.

Another potential threat to be considered is participants' experience evaluating faculty using teacher evaluation forms each semester in the university under study. There is no means to determine how much influence the content of those institutional evaluation forms could have had on participants' original, self-formed and unbiased opinions of what constitutes effective teaching. Therefore, all results of this study must be considered with this in mind. Similarly, the use of the 25 Likert-scale items placed directly in front of the open-ended questions on the data

gathering questionnaire could also have an influence on respondents' answers, and thus another potential contamination effect on study results is possible.

3.10.2 Questionnaire design

The data collection instrument was developed specifically for the study milieu. Therefore, the findings and results of the study are limited to how well the instrument actually captured the relevant characteristics of effective/ineffective teaching. To minimize this threat, the questionnaire was created based upon an exploratory study conducted in stage one to unearth conceptions from a small sample of the same population to be later surveyed for in-depth examination. In addition, the questionnaire was modelled upon existing research and literature on effective/ineffective teaching. Prior to the distribution of the questionnaire, three consecutive pilot tests were conducted on selected members of the four target population groups. This sampling process attempted to ensure that the resulting data collection instrument was as encompassing, as user friendly (students could understand language level), and as accurate as possible.

3.10.3 No assurance

Because of the different cultural backgrounds of students and since English was not the native language of 94% of students in the student population surveyed, no assurance can be made that they comprehended the meaning of each questionnaire item. However, this threat was minimized through the use of descriptions established primarily from transcriptions of students' own words in the exploratory interviews conducted with each student group. It was assumed that faculty would more easily interpret questionnaire items based on students' words rather that the other way around. Furthermore, the questionnaire based upon the transcribed student and teacher interviews was piloted on samples of science and English students and subsequently amended. The language used on the questionnaire instrument was purposely written using simple, clear, user-friendly,

student-based terms. It was written as comprehensively as possible in an attempt to capture the highest ranking descriptors of effective/ineffective teaching and to eliminate any confusion as to what the questions were asking.

3.10.4 Small scale

This research study was conducted using a small sample size of 44 students and 36 teachers in the English program, as well as 25 students and 28 faculty members in the science departments, resulting in 133 participants in total. Because of the small sample size conducted at a university in the United Arab Emirates, results can therefore only be valid for the particular population under study and can not be generalized to a larger or demographically different population group. However, to minimize error variance as much as possible, two tactics were employed. First, the two departments of the university with the largest student and faculty populations were surveyed, resulting in the largest sample size possible for the study environment. Second, the same questionnaire items were used on all four population groups within the study, thereby simplifying the data analysis process by allowing results to be compared across all four groups.

Conversely, during the design stage of the study, experimental variance was maximized by deliberately selecting the two most removed and distinct population groups that were available at the university under study: the Intensive English Program which focuses solely on developing English language skills, and the science department which utilizes English as a medium of communication to teach a wide variety of science disciplines.

3.10.5 Assumptions

Since this research study was conducted in a university setting where English was the official language of communication and instruction, it was assumed that all participants could read and understand English, were mature and capable of providing serious, accurate, thoughtful answers and, most importantly, gave honest consideration to their responses. I also assumed that all participants were what Tashakkori & Teddlie (1998:99) refer to as the ideal, faithful participant who:

> … tries to respond and/or behave in a "real" and "true" manner, regardless of his or her perceptions of the investigator and/or predictions/expectations of the study. The participant … remains faithful to the truth rather than to his or her perceptions of the investigation.

This concludes the discussion on how the study was designed and conducted. The study was based upon a method of analysis using recorded descriptive data first, followed by quantitative questionnaire items based on the population's descriptive data and results of research findings, and finally open-ended qualitative questions to allow comparisons between the three techniques to be conducted for study validity. In addition to contextualizing the study, describing the study participants, presenting the research questions to be investigated, and explaining how the empirical studies informed my study approach, a description of how the data was collected and analyzed has been presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Almost everyone in our society shares a huge misconception about teaching. By "everyone" I mean not only general public, but also teachers as well as parents, administrators, school board members, politicians, educational news reporters, and even the college professors who run teacher-preparation programs. What almost all fail to understand is that being an effective teacher may be the most difficult job of all in our society (Glasser, 1992:14).

4.0 Introduction

The research questions identified in Chapter 3 will be the focal point for this chapter. It will coalesce the findings revealed from three sources: statistical analysis of the 25 questionnaire items, recorded interviews, and the open-ended questionnaire items, and it will discuss the findings relevant to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2.

4.1 Research question 1: What are the predominant characteristics used by the study participants to describe excellent teaching?

Since the questionnaire items were categorized under two separate categories of effective teaching characteristics (personality and ability), the results from the questionnaire are presented in two different tables (4.1 and 4.2) and will be addressed in separate sub-sections. For the purpose of this discussion, characteristics which are rated as very important by the study respondents shall be categorized as predominant and discussed accordingly.

4.1.1 Personality

From Table 4.1 below, results from the questionnaire data indicate that according to the four population groups, the following six personality characteristics were very important (VI) to describe excellent teaching:

- are respectful of their students

- make classes interesting
- are fair in grading and evaluating student work
- care about students succeeding in their course
- show that they really like the subject they teach, and
- are friendly to students.

Also worthy of mention is that all remaining personality characteristics included in the questionnaire survey instrument were considered by the study respondents to be important (I) descriptors of excellent teaching. Thus, each one of the 11 personality characteristics specifically designed for the questionnaire was rated as either very important or important. This indicates that all personality characteristics reflected in the questionnaire were essential (average mean of 3.37, Table 4.1) to the entire sample population to describe excellent teaching, and should be considered by faculty interested in demonstrating to their students that they have effective teaching skills. It also gives an indication of the quality of the content of the questionnaire instrument.

Table 4.1
Descriptive statistics of the personality traits measure of effective teaching by entire sample (α=0.05)

Personality characteristics	Min	Max	Mean	Rate	S D	Rank
12. … are respectful of their students.	1	4	3.73	**VI**	.538	1
1. … make classes interesting.	1	4	3.70	**VI**	.522	2
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	1	4	3.67	**VI**	.612	3
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	1	4	3.56	**VI**	.632	4
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	1	4	3.53	**VI**	.713	5
6. … are friendly to students.	1	4	3.50	**VI**	.735	6
23. … welcome students' opinions/ suggestions.	1	4	3.38	I	.682	7
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	2	4	3.33	I	.693	8
4. … use humour in the classroom.	1	4	3.11	I	.781	9.5
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	1	4	3.11	I	.794	9.5
25. … have a unique teaching style.	1	4	2.50	I	1.049	11
	Average of means		**3.37**			

4.1.1.1 Are respectful of their students

According to the four population groups in this study, the most important characteristic of the excellent teacher to emerge is the personality trait "are respectful to their students" (mean 3.73, Table 4.1). This finding closely matches the high (2nd place) ranking of Feldman's trait (Table 2.2) "is concerned with, is friendly to and **respects** students" and matches the results from studies conducted specific to Arab students (Saafin, 2005; Raymond, 2001; Radford, 1980). An additional nine of the 14 studies examined in the literature review mentioned this trait as essential to capturing the definition of effective teaching (Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988).

As we have seen in the literature review, other researchers also report that teachers must demonstrate respect for their students from the moment of first encounter for effective teaching to transpire (Day, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Lowman, 1995).

Respect for students emerged as 9th highest trait to be mentioned in the qualitative, open-ended portion of the questionnaire instrument (Table 4.2 below).

Table 4.2
Part C – Characteristics of effective teachers extracted from open-ended questions and rank ordered

	VERB REFERENT STATEMENTS	English Students	Science Students	English Faculty	Science Faculty	Sum	Rank
1	***Makes class interesting/fun***	**11**	**14**	**15**	**10**	**50**	**1**
2	***Is friendly to students***	**16**	**10**	**6**	**5**	**37**	**2**
3	Really knows subject knowledge	6	1	14	6	27	3
4	***Cares about students' learning***	**8**	**1**	**12**	**4**	**25**	**4**
5	Makes lessons understandable	8	4	6	4	22	5
6	Is well prepared for class	5	3	8	2	18	6
7	***Is enthusiastic***	**5**		**5**	**7**	**17**	**7**
8	***Encourages students to think***	**2**		**7**	**7**	**16**	**8**
9	***Respects students***	**3**	**1**	**7**	**3**	**14**	**9**
10	***Has good teaching style***	**8**	**1**	**4**		**13**	**10.5**
11	***Understands how students think and feel***	**2**	**1**	**8**	**2**	**13**	**10.5**
12	***Gives support***	**3**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**11**	**12**
13	***Is approachable/available***	**1**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**10**	**13**
14	***Is fair***	**1**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**9**	**14**
15	***Has good sense of humour***	**3**	**2**		**2**	**7**	**15.5**
16	***Listens to students' questions & opinions***	**5**		**1**	**1**	**7**	**15.5**
17	Relates theory to outside world		1	3	2	6	17.5
18	Is professional	1		4	1	6	17.5
19	Has lots of experience	4	2			6	17.5
20	***Is adaptable/flexible***		**1**	**3**	**1**	**5**	**20**
21	***Is patient***	**3**		**1**		**4**	**21.5**
22	Develops new activities all the time	2			2	4	21.5
23	Makes students think			1	2	3	23.5
24	***Is kind***	**2**			**1**	**3**	**23.5**
25	Develops students' skills				2	2	25.5
26	***Is optimistic***	**1**			**1**	**2**	**25.5**
27	Provides punctual feedback	1			1	2	25.5
28	Uses clear objectives				2	2	25.5
29	Teaches students how to study	1			1	2	25.5
30	***Is honest***	**1**		**1**		**2**	**25.5**
31	***Interacts well with students***				**2**	**2**	**25.5**
32	***Has good imagination***				**2**	**2**	**25.5**
33	***Encourages students to improve***				**1**	**1**	**33.5**
34	***Has strong personality***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
35	***Is motivated***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
36	Gives lots of good homework		1			1	33.5
37	Does group work				1	1	33.5
38	***Is strict***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
39	Uses time wisely		1			1	33.5
40	Changes class location sometimes	1				1	33.5
41	***Has good self-presentation***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
42	***Works hard***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
43	***Makes students feel comfortable***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
44	Involves whole class	1				1	33.5
45	Is intelligent				1	1	33.5
46	Is consistent				1	1	33.5
					Total sum	**363**	

Ability characteristics	107	29%	
Personality characteristics	**256**	**71%**	
Sum	**363**	**100%**	

Note: italicized bold text indicates ***Personality*** factors; non-highlighted text indicates Ability factors.

Upon closer examination of Table 4.2, it appears that respect for students is more of a concern for English students and faculty than it is for the science department respondents. English faculty in particular mentioned this trait frequently, tempting one to conclude that English faculty, in addition to delivering content knowledge, also prepare university students by inculcating in them the social behavioural skills such as respect for self, others, their teachers/professors, and institutional policies and procedures. "Creating an environment that is mutually respectful is the most important thing that excellent teachers can do" is how one English faculty respondent answered this open-ended question on the questionnaire.

Only after comparing my study results against how students and faculty across many cultures rated respect for students did it become apparent that this trait was not unique to the Gulf region, but appears, rather, to be a characteristic common to most of the views expressed in the literature. This suggests that if faculty members do not exhibit genuine respect for their students, they run the risk of low student participation as well as low performance evaluation scores even if they are superlative in demonstrating all other aspects of effective teaching. Saafin's observations resulting from the study he conducted in a similar environment at approximately the same time as mine support the emphasis placed on respect in this culture. "… Arab learner's culture played a role in shaping the kind of learning culture that the participants talked about in this study … . Friendliness, **respect** [emphasis mine], generosity and willingness to compromise are some aspects of the Arab culture …" that were "… strongly emphasized by the participants" (Saafin, 2005: 256).

4.1.1.2 Make classes interesting/fun

The second highest overall rated effective personality teaching trait as revealed by this study's respondents is the descriptor "makes classes interesting" (mean 3.70, Table 4.1). This trait ranked high in both components of this study (questionnaire results, and open-ended questions). "Make classes interesting and fun" was the most frequently mentioned trait mentioned in the open-ended question (Table 4.2), providing further support as to the importance of this finding. "An

excellent teacher should regularly succeed in inculcating a love of knowledge" are the words written by one ESL instructor while answering the open-ended question on the survey instrument.

The high rating of this trait is also consistent with the high ranking in the literature review (3rd highest, Table 2.2) as reported by previous researchers (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Raymond, 2001; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988). This result suggests that students look forward to and appreciate classes that are stimulating rather than boring. As we have seen above, other subject matter experts also discuss the importance of making classes interesting through exhibiting enthusiasm for the topic (Day, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000; Kyriacou, 1998; Robertson, 1996; Stones, 1992; Lowman, 1995; Dunne & Wragg, 1994). Chickering & Gamson's argument that "… teaching methods that encourage student activity and involvement … are likely to be superior to more passive methods when higher-level cognitive or affective learning is the goal" (1991: 18) appears to summarize what my study respondents were communicating. The answer provided by an English teacher to the open-ended question encapsulates the importance of this effective teaching characteristic as expressed both in the literature and by student and faculty participants in this study, "Engages the learners in the subject in a way that makes them excited about it and want to learn."

4.1.1.3 Are fair in grading and evaluating student work

Being "fair in grading and evaluating student work" was the third most prominent effective teaching characteristic as reported by my study respondents. Both English and science faculty rated this trait as their most important descriptor of excellent teaching (Appendix 21) while science students rated it 5th overall as contrasted to English students' lower rating of 7th position (Appendix 20). This suggests that faculty at the university where the study was conducted have high ethical standards. The lower rating given to this trait, notably by English students, may suggest that students new to the university culture are experiencing a new

phenomenon – objective benchmarks. Frequently in the past I have been approached by students after posting exam results with comments such as: "I have never had a C in my life. Has something happened to my brain?" My response is to tell the students that they are facing a higher standard of evaluation that is set by an internal system which is based upon a rubric and which can not be adjusted through external pressure. Of course I also encourage them to work harder and to keep adapting to their new environment. Fairness in grading and evaluating student work rated not as high in the literature review (5th overall, Table 2.2) as it did in the current study, but the importance of objectivity to effective teaching has been discussed methodically in the literature reviewed (Saafin, 2005; Day, 2004; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Raymond, 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Hay McBer, 2000; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988).

4.1.1.4 Care about students succeeding in their course

The fourth highest rated personality characteristic of effective teaching to emerge from my study was "caring about students succeeding in their course" and was also ranked fourth highest according to the open-ended question on the survey instrument (Table 4.2). Science students ranked this trait as their second most important indicator of teaching excellence as opposed to a lower rating from the English students (mean difference of -.25, Appendix 20). Conversely, English faculty rated this trait higher (3rd overall) than did their colleagues in the sciences (5th ranking, Appendix 21). This is an interesting juxtaposition, suggesting that perhaps English teachers act in a more supportive, surrogate parent role for their pre-university students. English students may therefore assume this to be the norm in a university setting and therefore mentioned it less frequently as an indicator of effective teaching than did the more experienced science students who are taught in much larger, more impersonal lecture hall settings where students must be more independent to succeed. This trait of genuinely caring for students' success was also important to researchers examined in this study (Saafin, 2005; Day, 2004; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Hay McBer, 2000; Robertson, 1996; Lowman, 1995; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez &

Mateo, 1992; Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988; Radford, 1980). Making a link between this study's results and the literature, Borich (2000) describes effective teachers as those who "… provide a warm and encouraging classroom climate by letting students know help is available" (27). The essence of this characteristic of effective teaching is captured by the simple words one science student used to describe effective teachers in the open-ended question: "To actually care about their students".

4.1.1.5 Show that they really like the subject they teach

"Showing that they really like the subject they teach" was another predominant personality trait as revealed by this study's respondents, ranking equally high by both faculty groups (mean 3.53, Table 4.1) and lowest by English students (8th rank, Appendix 20). This important trait was tied for first place in the literature review results (Table 2.2), being argued for by previous researchers (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Raymond, 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Keller *et al.*, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988; Radford, 1980). Robertson (1996) points out the importance of the effective teacher who must convey genuine and positive interest towards the topic he/she is communicating, as well as the importance of demonstrating sincere interest in the students themselves. He asserts that enthusiasm is critical to maintaining student interest and attention, and this enthusiasm can be conveyed to students through maintaining a strong interest in the subject in an almost persuasive way. But if the teacher does not sincerely convey this enthusiasm and positive subject attitude, wrote Stones (1992), then it is highly unlikely that students will become infected with the positive attitudes and emotions essential for the learning situation to be successful, and the teacher's efforts will be in vain. A negative mean difference of -.13 occurring between faculty and students (Appendix 24) suggest faculty value this trait higher than do their charges. The large disparity between the two student groups, however (-.28, Appendix 20), presents an opportunity to better understand what transpires in students' transformation as they move from mandatory EFL

classes into their chosen majors. A higher rating of this trait by science students most likely results from their need to feel some sense of excitement and adventure from their teachers to motivate them to continue to pursue their chosen path. I doubt few, if any, English student respondents in this study, on the other hand, are considering a future as an English teacher since Education is not one of the majors offered at this university.

4.1.1.6 Are friendly to students

The last predominant (very important) personality attribute of effective teaching that emerged from the study respondents was the characteristic "are friendly to students". This 6th highest ranked personality trait (mean 3.50, Table 4.1) was placed 3rd highest by the students and occupied 7th position according to the faculty (Appendix 24). Following on from the previous findings, English students rated this trait as their premier characteristic (along with makes classes interesting), while the more experienced, more independent science students ranked this item 6th of the eleven personality characteristics measured in the questionnaire. This provides further evidence that close relationships with their teachers is particularly important to pre-university level students. The literature study also ranked this trait in second position overall (Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Raymond, 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988; Radford, 1980). Chickering & Gamson's (1991) view of maintaining contact with students both inside and outside the classroom is fully supported by this finding. A more recent finding relative to this same predominant trait as viewed by adult Arab students in the same setting as my study, and which provides constancy to this finding is provided by Saafin (2005) in the discussion of his study results:

> The number of responses identified in the data collected from students … clearly indicates that teachers' friendliness is of high value for Arab students. There was a perfect consensus among the participants in all three phases that friendliness of EFL teachers was very necessary. … To have a social context without friendliness is something not expected or desirable. … The Arab culture values friendliness and considers it as one of the important characteristics of 'a good person' (88).

A comparison of how students and faculty rated the eleven personality characteristics contained in the questionnaire instrument can be reviewed in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3
Descriptive statistics used to compare student and faculty perspectives on the importance of personality characteristics of excellent teachers

	Students					Faculty				
Personality Characteristics of Excellent Faculty	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**Rate**	**Rank**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**Rate**	**Rank**
1. … make classes interesting.	2	4	3.71	VI	1.5	1	4	3.69	VI	3
12. … are respectful of their students.	2	4	3.71	VI	1.5	1	4	3.75	VI	2
6. … are friendly to students.	1	4	3.62	VI	3	2	4	3.36	I	7
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	1	4	3.52	VI	4	1	4	3.61	VI	4
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	1	4	3.46	I	5.5	2	4	3.59	VI	5
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	1	4	3.46	I	5.5	3	4	3.89	VI	1
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	2	4	3.39	I	7	2	4	3.27	I	8
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	2	4	3.38	I	8	1	4	3.39	I	6
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	1	4	3.09	I	9	2	4	3.14	I	10
25. … have a unique teaching style.	1	4	3.07	I	10	1	4	1.88	SI	11
4. … use humour in the classroom.	1	4	2.97	I	11	2	4	3.25	I	9
Average of means			**3.39**	**Average of means**				**3.34**		

Of the eleven personality traits included in the survey instrument, six were rated as **very important** (dominant) and five were rated as **important** descriptors of the effective teacher. This high ranking of each of the eleven personality characteristics included in the survey instrument provides further verification as to the cultural appropriateness of the survey instrument. Though it can be seen that there are some minor differences in opinion between how students and faculty rated the personality traits included in the questionnaire instrument, it is evident that there is substantial agreement between students and faculty views as to which traits are deemed important to effective teaching. Foremost amongst all the personality characteristics which contribute to teaching of the highest level in the perspectives of students and faculty in a Gulf university setting, this study findings reveal that

teachers who demonstrate genuine respect for their students, make classes interesting and exciting places to be, are fair in all students' dealings, care about students' success, genuinely enjoy teaching their subject matter and are always friendly and approachable are more likely to be effective in transferring knowledge to their students, and in return more likely to be rated higher in faculty evaluations.

Now let us examine the predominant (rated very important) ability characteristics emerging from the study.

4.1.2 Ability

According to the four population groups, three ability attributes emerged as dominant (very important) by the study participants to describe excellent teaching:

- encourage students' questions and discussion
- are always well prepared and organized, and
- make difficult subjects easy to learn.

Table 4.4
Descriptive statistics of the ability characteristics measure of effective teaching by entire sample (α=0.05)

Ability characteristics	Min	Max	Mean	Rate	S D	Rank
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	1	4	3.65	**VI**	.618	1
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	2	4	3.57	**VI**	.619	2
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	1	4	3.53	**VI**	.691	3
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	1	4	3.41	I	.729	4
15. … require students to think critically.	1	4	3.40	I	.685	5
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	1	4	3.27	I	.730	6
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	1	4	3.17	I	.713	7
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	1	4	2.97	I	.887	8
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	1	4	2.77	I	.784	9
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	1	4	2.52	I	.982	10
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	1	4	2.34	SI	.806	11
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	1	4	2.17	SI	.958	12
24. … assign a lot of homework.	1	4	2.02	SI	.738	13
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	1	4	1.68	SI	.865	14
	Average of means		**2.89**			

4.1.2.1 Encourage students' questions and discussion

Table 4.4 above indicates that three ability attributes were considered to be very important descriptors of effective teachers to the entire sample and that the highest ranked ability trait used to define excellent teaching emerged as "encourage students' questions and discussion". Overall, this ranked the 4th highest of all questionnaire personality and ability characteristics with a mean of 3.65 (Appendix 19). However, of the 42 diverse attributes extracted from the open-ended question data on the survey instrument (Table 4.2), no reference was made to encouraging students' questions and discussion. This highlights the difficulties faced by researchers in trying to create verb-referent statements to capture everything that teachers must do in order to be deemed effective in the classroom. What was unexpectedly discovered is that both faculty groups rated this measure as their most important ability characteristic. Even more of a surprise and a further challenge to my assumptions was that the science faculty's mean was even higher (-.10, Appendix 26) than was the English teachers'. This suggests that even though science faculty members have larger classes, their preferred instructional style is one of two-way communication with their students as opposed to a one-way lecture format. This characteristic (is open to students' ideas, opinions, and discussion) also rated high in the literature summary (Appendix 1), tying for second place overall (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Raymond, 2001; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988). This study finding, that both students and faculty view actively engaging students in their learning process through effective questioning techniques as an important indicator of teaching effectiveness, is consistent with views expressed by others in the literature (Day, 2004; Borich, 2000; Hay McBer, 2000; Robertson, 1996; Lowman, 1995; Chickering & Gamson, 1991). Robertson (1996) for example, argues that excellent teachers exhibit respect for their students by their use of questioning techniques which will allow students to feel that they are contributing to the lesson through a process of mutual respect and mutual enquiry. The slight difference in how students rated this item (mean difference +.34, Appendix 25) possibly reflects the smaller class sizes in the EFL program where students' learning also involves a large

element of two-way communication (speaking and listening skills development) as part of the curriculum. All four population groups rated this to be a very important descriptor of effective teachers and no significant differences appear between groups.

4.1.2.2 Are always well prepared and organized

The second of three predominant ability attributes viewed as very important by the study respondents is the descriptor of teachers who "are always well prepared and organized" (Table 4.4). Rated 5th highest of the 25 teaching characteristics examined through statistical analysis, (mean 3.57, Appendix 19), being prepared and organized also rated very high in the literature review (3rd place, Appendix 1) and was discussed by earlier researchers (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988; Radford, 1980). Nearly 20 years ago, Feldman had this to say, "Across the various sets of studies and methods of comparison, it is clear that students and faculty were similar in placing high importance on teachers being prepared and organized …" (1988: 321). This quote has been purposely included here to help us understand that teachers' preparedness is still considered a crucially important issue in the eyes of former (teachers, professors) and current students in how effective teachers are judged, and that the importance of some characteristics appear to be consistent over time. The view expressed by both student and faculty respondents in this study that effective teachers demonstrate organizational skills and are ready to deliver their materials to students is also consistent with views expressed by the Anderson (2004) and Hay McBer (2000) reports, Borich (2000), Kyriacou (1998), Robertson (1996), Lowman (1995), and Dunne & Wragg (1994).

Results from the open-ended question also indicate the importance of teachers being prepared to stand and deliver well-organized materials and lessons to their students (6th position, table 4.2). In answering the interview question, "Twenty years from now, what do you think you will remember the most from your best university teachers/professors?, one science student seized this opportunity to help

us realize the importance of this trait from learners' perspectives: "… how he interacts with his students and was always prepared for class."

4.1.2.3 Make difficult subjects easy to learn

The last predominant effective teaching ability attribute to emerge from this study conducted in the United Arab Emirates was the aptitude of teachers to make difficult subjects easy to learn (Table 4.4). This characteristic, like all others discussed while answering this first research question, appears to be common as well. The literature review meta-table ranks this as 4th most important ("explains using simple terms") and was important to preceding researchers indicated in Appendix 1 (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988; Radford, 1980). Robertson (1996) and Stones (1992) both included the last of Feldman's characteristic "Relates content to real life" in their descriptors of the effective teacher. According to both authors, in order for students to learn at the deepest level, they must be given the opportunity to relate new concepts to the material world, and must be provided relevant first-hand experiences by the excellent teacher whenever possible. Other researchers (Day, 2004; Hay McBer, 2000; Kyriacou, 1998; Robertson, 1996; Stones, 1992; and Brookfield, 1990) also strongly support this in-class strategy of relating topics to real-life applications. Science students apparently appreciate this approach to teaching as they rated this skill their most important. The understanding of abstract, scientific topics being delivered to them − in a foreign language for the majority − are communicated more effectively by relating invisible, intangible topics to real-life, visual examples. While the English faculty rated this lower than did any of the other respondent groups (yet still very important), the relatively higher rating by science faculty (-1.4, Appendix 26) supports the argument that science topics are better understood by students when simplified. Science faculty's slightly higher rating of this attribute could possibly reflect their familiarity with this essential instructional ability.

A comparison between how students and faculty rated the eleven ability characteristics found in the questionnaire instrument is presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5
Descriptive statistics used to compare student and faculty perspectives on the importance of ability characteristics of excellent teachers – open-ended question

	Students					Faculty				
Ability Characteristics of Excellent Faculty	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**Rate**	**Rank**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**Rate**	**Rank**
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	2	4	3.55	VI	1	2	4	3.59	VI	3
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	2	4	3.52	VI	2	1	4	3.55	VI	4
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	1	4	2.51	I	3	1	4	1.81	SI	13
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	1	4	3.43	I	4	3	4	3.88	VI	1
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	1	4	3.42	I	5	1	4	3.39	I	6
15. … require students to think critically.	1	4	3.17	I	6	2	4	3.64	VI	2
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	1	4	3.10	I	7	2	4	3.25	I	7
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	1	4	3.09	I	8	2	4	3.47	I	5
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	1	4	2.88	I	9.5	1	4	2.66	I	9
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	1	4	2.88	I	9.5	1	4	3.06	I	8
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	1	4	2.83	I	11	1	4	2.19	SI	10
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	1	4	2.55	I	12	1	4	2.11	SI	11
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	1	4	2.22	SI	13	1	3	1.11	NI	14
24. … assign a lot of homework.	1	4	2.14	SI	14	1	4	1.88	SI	12
Average of means			**2.95**	**Average of means**				**2.82**		

Of the fourteen ability characteristics included in the survey instrument, three were rated very important and seven were rated as important descriptors of effective teaching. It is evident from Table 4.5 that a high degree of similarity has been expressed in the views of student and faculty on the importance of the ability attributes included in the survey instrument. Differences in opinion will be discussed in the next section.

4.2 Research question 2: To what extent are student perceptions of effective teaching similar to those of faculty?

Even though numerous matches appeared amongst the four population groups in regards to excellent teaching, some minor mismatches did surface. In other words, what the participating students appeared to value in their instructors differed in some instances from what the participating faculty seemed to regard as very important to teaching excellence. What follows is a synopsis of those matches and mismatches which appeared between the student and the faculty data regarding excellent teaching perceptions. This will be followed by a more in-depth analysis of the questionnaire results specifically addressing personality and ability classifications of teaching characteristics similar to how question one above was answered.

4.2.1 Matches

Table 4.6 below indicates the major matches of personality and ability factors between students and faculty unveiled in this study to describe the effective teacher.

Table 4.6
Major matches between faculty and students in descriptors used to describe effective teaching

Personality Traits	Ability Characteristics
Are respectful of their students	Encourage students' questions and discussion
Make classes interesting	Are always well-prepared and organized
Care about students succeeding in their course	Make difficult subjects easy to learn
Show that they really like the subject they teach	
Are friendly to students	

Participating students and teachers agreed on a number of characteristics they believed distinguished between the effective and ineffective university instructor. Both students and faculty regarded highly as very important (VI) the quality to treat learners with respect and caring. The participating teachers' and students' perceptions also matched with regard to making classes interesting, caring about

their students' success, demonstrating a love for teaching and being friendly. In addition to the five personality characteristics listed above, three ability characteristics were also stressed as being very important (VI) to all participants: encouraging students' questions, being well-prepared and organized and having a knack for making difficult subjects understandable. Thus, according to these study participants, both skills and affective factors are necessary virtues to paint a portrait of the effective university instructor/professor. Of note, all of these personality and ability factors used to describe excellent teaching were highly compatible with the literature reviewed for this paper.

4.2.2 Mismatches

By referring to data in Table 4.7 below which has been constructed from Appendices 24 and 29, it can be seen that four characteristics were considered by students (underlined text) to be more important than faculty (**bold text**) in this study.

Table 4.7
Major mismatches between faculty and students in descriptors used to describe effective teaching

Personality Traits	Ability Characteristics
Have a unique teaching style	Give many quizzes and tests
Are fair in grading and evaluating student work	Use the latest computer technology in their teaching
	Have many years of teaching experience
Underlined text = students' views	**Require students to think critically**
Bold text = faculty views	**Encourage students' questions and discussion**
	Expect students to become independent learners

Differences (mismatches) in opinions between the faculty and student groups occur when the mean difference is greater than 0.30. Student results indicate that having a unique teaching style, giving a lot of tests, using the latest computer technology and having many years of teaching experience was more important than it was to faculty members. Students who express the view that each teacher should have his or her own style is possibly a reflection upon the inexperience of the

undergraduate student participants in this survey who perhaps feel that faculty have the responsibility to perform entertaining lectures and classes for them. Similarly, students indicating that they would prefer a teacher who gives them lots of tests suggests that students are looking for personal feedback and practice opportunities, rather than being graded for the entire semester by one final exam. Students also rated teachers who use computer technology as more important than did the teachers themselves possibly reflects that the former are more attuned to the latest developments in computer technology than their instructors who are possibly using all their spare time preparing lectures, examinations and demands for teaching portfolios placed upon them.

Conversely, faculty rated as more important than students the ability to think critically, being fair in grading, encouraging students' questions and discussion, and expecting students to become independent learners. Once again we can see what appear to be differences in opinion between relatively inexperienced undergraduate Arab students who are more comfortable with group learning practices in comparison to experienced faculty, mostly educated in the West, and thus accustomed with questioning everything and with the concept of individual learning responsibilities. Students of the Islamic faith, as we have observed above, begin their education memorizing and never disputing their sanctified text (Holy Koran), and would therefore find it difficult to dispute what their educators are offering to them. They would also, I suggest, not be comfortable with interrupting their teachers to ask questions or to open discussion, again because of their unfamiliarity with this approach and due to their reverence for their teachers, and in particular older, more experienced teachers. Finally, as was pointed out earlier, the fact that students in this survey did not appear to have any issues with fair/objective grading is possibly an indicator of their unfamiliarity with objective benchmarks and thus is another manifestation of the respect and trust they place in their educators. This represents an overview of the results arising from the questionnaire data. Next, let us examine more deeply how respondents rated personality and ability traits.

Consistent with the approach taken to answering research question 1 and since the questionnaire was designed to measure respondent opinions of two distinct characteristics of excellent teaching (personality and ability), the results from the

questionnaire are presented in two different tables (4.8 and 4.9) and will be addressed in separate sub-sections. Likert scale ratings will be used as a basis of comparison between student and faculty perceptions of excellent teaching.

4.2.3 Personality

Table 4.8 below represents personality findings extracted from the data and is presented to explain similarities between students and faculty on personality characteristics of effective teaching. Many similarities can be observed between the students and faculty of this study conducted in the Gulf region. Both groups consider making classes interesting, being respectful of students and caring about students' success to be very important (VI) or predominant characteristics of effective teaching. Furthermore, both students and faculty respondents share the perception that effective teaching is exhibited by teachers who remain available to students outside of class, who are open to students' input, make an effort to learn their students' names and who employ appropriate humour in the classroom. Three other personality items – being friendly to students, demonstrating that they like their subject and being fair when dealing with students – were also considered as either important or very important to both groups. This once again suggests a high degree of similarity in their opinions of what constitutes effective teaching. Only one personality trait appeared to indicate difference of opinion between students and faculty; the latter group did not consider having a unique teaching style to be a critical determinant of effective teaching. Faculty in general indicated that having their own teaching style was only somewhat important while students indicated that this trait was an important indicator of effective teaching. One explanation for this difference in view could be due to the lack of experience of students, especially English students who may be looking more for entertainment in the classroom rather than learning a mandatory topic. It is interesting to note, however, that both student groups did rate this personality trait comparatively low (Appendix 20).

Table 4.8
Student and faculty overall ratings of personality characteristics of effective teaching

Personality characteristics of excellent teaching	Student ratings	Faculty ratings
Make classes interesting	**VI**	**VI**
Are respectful of their students	**VI**	**VI**
Are friendly to students	VI	I
Care about students succeeding in their course	**VI**	**VI**
Show that they really like the subject they teach	I	VI
Are fair in grading and evaluating student work	I	VI
Are available to help students outside of class	**I**	**I**
Welcome students' opinions/suggestions	**I**	**I**
Make an effort to get to know their students	**I**	**I**
Have a unique teaching style	**I**	SI
Use humour in the classroom	**I**	**I**

4.2.3.1 English students as compared to English faculty

In examining significant differences between how English students view excellent teaching as compared to their instructors, reference can be made to Appendix 27. Statistical analysis applied to comparisons between each subgroup has resulted in some noteworthy differences in opinion. When differences in means are greater than 0.30, those differences are discussed.

A number of disparities are raised between the two subgroups as English students appear to display their unfamiliarity with university systems. They rate two traits more important than English faculty: are friendly to students and have a unique teaching style. The answer one English student provided to describe effective instructors helps us to comprehend what some students may expect from teachers relative to teaching style: "… it's so important for teacher to not just stand and talk for whole class … each must teach in his own way but bring students into the learning." Other answers to the open-ended question on the questionnaire instrument will also help us to understand the importance of this trait to the English student (ES) participants in this study. *Please note: students' words from this point forward are replicated here exactly as they wrote them on the survey instrument. No attempt has been made to indicate errors in their writings (e.g. [sic]) as this would distract from the discussion*.

English students wrote the following:

> ES1. The professor should make the class interesting and make a different style of teaching so the students won't be bored.
>
> ES2. … like to teach and always change his/her teaching style.
>
> ES3. A unique teaching class.
>
> ES4. The instructor/professor should have a unique teaching style, welcome students opinions and care about student.
>
> ES5. For me I like the teacher to have a lot of unique teaching style.

English students in this study therefore tend to express an expectation that teachers must be creative while delivering their curriculum. Similarly, Saafin concluded that for Arab students learning English in colleges and universities in the UAE that "… using different methods and examples would be very helpful in maximizing the chance of understanding the meaning of new words" (2005:131).

Regarding how English students felt about the experience of the teacher, these excerpts from the open-ended question paint a better picture for us:

> ES1. He has many experience in his work.
>
> ES2. A lot of experience.
>
> ES3. Friendly, have a good experience, and updated with everything happening in his major.

English faculty (EF), on the other hand, rated the trait of being fair in grading and evaluating student work as more important than did their students. Answers to the open-ended question on the questionnaire instrument help us to understand the importance of this trait to the English faculty. English teachers answered as follows (emphasis mine):

> EF1. I strongly believe that Ss learn best from Ts they like & respect & have fun with. These qualities combined W / up-to-date content knowledge, **fair grading procedures**, and innovative teaching practices make an excellent university teacher.
>
> EF2. I would say professional, **fair**, dynamic, knowledgeable are important.

EF3. … respect, **fairness**, preparedness, enthusiasm.

EF4. … good organization, **fairness**, being caring and communicating a caring, respectful attitude.

Chickering & Gamson's words summarize what the above faculty and student quotes are telling us: "Frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement. Faculty concern helps students get through rough times" (1991:65).

4.2.3.2 Science students as compared to science faculty

A comparison of the significant differences between the science students and science professors on the personality traits of effective teachers possibly indicates the largest variation between any of the two population groups, as can be seen in Appendix 23. Science faculty (SF) members rated seven personality characteristics as indicators of excellent teaching higher than did their students. Professors would more likely describe the excellent teacher as one who makes classes interesting, are fair in grading and evaluations, welcome students' opinions and suggestions, and use humour in their teaching. Going beyond the Likert scale statistical analysis, making classes interesting is what science faculty volunteered in the open-ended question to communicate their views on the second highest predominant characteristic of effective teachers:

SF1. … enthusiasm, imagination.

SF2. ... be entertaining.

SF3. Make subject interesting.

SF4. He/she gets the students interested in the subject – learn by doing.

SF5. Ability to make the subject interesting and … engaging with humour.

Science students (SS), on the other hand, placed more emphasis on descriptors of excellent instructors such as having their own unique teaching style (+.88, Appendix 23).

Another observable difference in results warrants discussion at this point. Even though all respondent groups rated respect as a very important trait, a ranking difference of -2.5 between science students and science faculty indicates a potential for conflict between the two groups. One possible explanation is that perhaps science students sampled for this study do not feel as respected as they would like to be. Conversely, it is possible that some faculty respondents are of the opinion that their position automatically demands respect in the university society, sending a negative message to those who hold that respect is something that is earned, not an entitlement.

4.2.4 Ability

Table 4.9 below represents the findings extracted from the data and is presented to explain similarities between students and faculty on the ability characteristics of effective teaching. As found with personality traits, considerable overlap exists between how students and faculty of this study conducted at a university in the Gulf view ability characteristics of effective teaching. Both groups consider effective teachers to be always well prepared for their classes and have the ability to make difficult topics easy to learn. In addition, both students and faculty agree that being current with their topic, providing frequent student feedback, expecting students to become independent learners, maintaining a well-disciplined classroom environment and encouraging students to work in groups are all important traits for excellent teachers to demonstrate. One overall area where differences occur between students and faculty – lecturing (talking) for the entire class – is viewed as not important to faculty but is considered on average as somewhat important to students. English students rated this ability higher than any other group, suggesting perhaps that in their inexperience with higher education, they assume their roles to be passive learners and that non-interactive lecturing is the standard mode of delivery in their majors. Despite this finding, however, it can be

reasonably concluded that student and faculty perceptions of what constitutes effective teaching are to a large extent very similar. Other sub-group differences which have emerged will be discussed below.

Table 4.9
Student and faculty overall ratings of ability characteristics of effective teaching

Ability characteristics of excellent teaching	Student ratings	Faculty ratings
Are always well prepared and organized	**VI**	**VI**
Make difficult subjects easy to learn	**VI**	**VI**
Have many years of teaching experience	I	SI
Encourage students' questions and discussion	I	VI
Have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject	**I**	**I**
Require students to think critically	I	VI
Give frequent feedback about student progress	**I**	**I**
Expect students to become independent learners	**I**	**I**
Maintain strict control over the class	**I**	**I**
Encourage students to learn in pairs/groups	**I**	**I**
Use the latest computer technology in their teaching	I	SI
Give many quizzes and tests	I	SI
Lecture (talk) for the entire class period	SI	NI
Assign a lot of homework	**SI**	**SI**

4.2.4.1 English students as compared to English faculty

In examining significant differences between how English students view excellent teaching as compared to their instructors, reference can be made to Appendix 27. Variances between the two sub-groups again appear to suggest English students' unfamiliarity with university systems. They rate all of the following ability attributes as more important than English faculty: maintain strict classroom control, give lots of tests, use the latest computer technology, has lots of teaching experience, and deliver instruction by lecture techniques. Answers to the open-ended question on the questionnaire instrument help us to understand the importance of these characteristics to English students:

ES1. In my opinion, the excellent professor who is strick control the

class, has a unique teaching style, and gives many quizzes or tests.

ES2: Give many tests and frequent feedback to students.

English faculty, on the other hand, rated the ability characteristics of requiring students to become critical thinkers, encouraging questions and discussion as well as expecting students to become independent learners as more important than did their young charges who are likely inexperienced with these concepts of higher education. Answers to the open-ended question on the questionnaire instrument help us to understand English faculty perspectives of these attributes:

> EF1. An excellent teacher should regularly succeed in inculcating a love of knowledge.
>
> EF2. One who understands the Ss needs & learning preferences & can facilitate high-order thinking in the learning process.
>
> EF3. An excellent university instructor should teach students how to learn: How to be better students; how to take control of their own learning; how to be responsible for their own success.
>
> EF4. One who encourages critical thinking.

Relative to how English faculty assess encouraging students' questions and discussion, as well as to the importance of assisting students to become independent learners, English faculty had this to say:

> EF1. An excellent professor is one who is always open-minded – actually welcomes students' questions, opinions, and suggestions. One who uses what students say and contribute to bringing the learning process to life!
>
> EF2. … listen to them, have time for students outside of class, be creative and fun in class, be a friend and a teacher.
>
> EF3. The ability to motivate students to learn.
>
> EF4. … develops a supportive atmosphere in the classroom where students take responsibility for their learning.

Thus, findings from this study appear to correspond to what Beishuizen *et al.* (2001) found in their study conducted in the Netherlands. Similar to the English students in my study, primary students in Holland "… described good teachers primarily as competent instructors, focussing on transfer of knowledge and skills …"

whereas secondary students and faculty at the same institute in Leiden "… emphasised relational aspects of good teachers …" (2001:185) reflecting what has just been discussed with the English faculty comments. Furthermore, "Young students displayed an ability view while older students [and faculty] showed a personality view on good teachers" (Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001:196).

4.2.4.2 Science students as compared to science faculty

Finally, a comparison of the significant differences between the science students and science professors indicates once again somewhat different views between the two groups, as can be seen in Appendix 28. Science faculty members rated six ability characteristics to be more important indicators of excellent teaching than did their students. Professors would more likely describe the excellent teacher as one who requires students to think critically, encourages students to work in small groups or in pairs, gets to know their students, and encourages students' discussion and questions. To help us identify with the environment at the time the study was conducted, the following quotes taken from the open-ended qualitative questions are presented:

> SF1. Someone who can get the students to question ideas/concepts – create a genuine interest in learning. Someone that "pushes" the students to do their best.
>
> SF2. Student centred learning manoeuvres that guide students to independent knowledge and skills acquisition.
>
> SF3. … engage the students in critical thinking and new ways of looking at the world & their learning who then reflects on the process & seeks ways to improve.
>
> SF4. Interact with students on a professional and personal level.
>
> SF5. … engage students by asking them leading questions, then use their answers so they can relate discussion to real life, so they can identify what has been taught.

Science students (SS), on the other hand, would place more emphasis on ability descriptors of excellent instructors such as being current with the latest

technology and up-to-date with their subject knowledge. In addition, science students would describe the excellent teacher as one who has more teaching experience, and who assigns lots of tests and homework, as well as employing lecturing as a means of teaching. This is how they expressed themselves in the open-ended question which helps to clarify their point of view:

> SS1. Many Q and tests well help.
>
> SS2. To have experience as a teacher and not just looking to his degree and see how good is it because maybe he was a good student but not good teacher.

As we have seen in the literature review, opportunities to work in groups was also reported as a learning preference by Arab students according to Saafin (2005), Raymond (2001), and Radford (1980). What has not been located in the literature and is raised in this analysis as a topic for future research, especially in the Gulf region where age is highly respected, is the relationship between the teaching experience (or age) of the teacher and students' ratings of the teacher's effectiveness.

4.3 Research question 3: To what extent are student perceptions of ineffective teaching similar to those of faculty?

To answer this question, descriptive data that was collected through interviews and respondents' answers to an open-ended question in part C of the questionnaire asking them to describe in their own words the ineffective teacher will be compared. As above, results will therefore make use of respondents' exact words extracted from the taped interviews and from the open-ended question. The numbers in the columns in Table 4.10 below indicate the number of times each verb-referent statement was referred to during the taped interviews (I) and from the open-ended question (O) asking respondents to state in their own words the most striking characteristics of the ineffective/worst university instructor/professor.

Table 4.10
Student and faculty perceptions of ineffective teaching extracted from interviews (I) and open-ended question (O)

Verb-referent statements	Students		Faculty	
	I	**O**	**I**	**O**
Is disrespectful of students	22	**14**	5	**13**
Doesn't care if students understand	10	12	15	30
Is boring	**13**	7	**10**	13
Cannot explain well	**9**	8	**10**	5
Is unprepared for class	3	**5**	7	**7**
Is unfair in grading	8	**9**	0	**9**

From Table 4.10 above which condenses information extracted from Appendix 5 (Interviews) and Table 4.5 (Open-ended question), it can be observed that students' and teachers' perceptions of ineffective teaching coincide with regard to a number of attributes. Both groups describe the ineffective teacher as someone who does not demonstrate respect for his/her students, does not care, is boring, can not explain the subject matter well, is unprepared for class and is unfair in grading students. In some instances, such as not caring if students understand, a perfect match was not observed; however it was reported with such high frequency by both groups that it was deemed to be a common descriptor of the ineffective teacher according to this study's respondents. Worthy of mention is that in order to paint as comprehensive a portrait of the ineffective teacher as possible, participants were asked during the interview process to describe the ineffective teacher as a means of verifying whether the emergent characteristics of the ineffective teacher would result in a mirror image of the effective teacher. Hence, employing this technique was a deliberately planned tactic of validating responses, and was also used as a process to question a statement made by Walls *et al.* (2002) that the "good" teacher was not at all the mirror image of the "bad" teacher. Findings from this study indicate that most respondents do indeed hold mirror images of effective/ineffective teaching traits. Table 4.11 below, which compares the characteristics of effective teaching extracted from research question 2 alongside the results of the ineffective teacher revealed from the interviews and open-ended question discussion, suggest that at least to the population sampled in the Gulf region, there is agreement that study participants do view the two extremes as polar images of each other.

Table 4.11
A comparison of effective and ineffective teaching characteristics

Effective teachers (Results of research question 2)	Ineffective teachers (Results of research question 3)
Are respectful of their students	***Are disrespectful of students***
Care about students succeeding in their course	***Don't care if students understand***
Make classes interesting	***Are boring***
Make difficult subjects easy to learn	Cannot explain well
Are always well prepared and organized	Are unprepared for class
Are fair in grading and evaluating student work	***Are unfair in grading***

Note: personality measures are highlighted in *italicized* **bold** font.

What follows is a discussion of each emergent characteristic of ineffective teaching according to the findings of the current investigation. To assist the reader to relate to the environment at the time the study was conducted, excerpts from the interviews and the open-ended question will be provided.

4.3.1 Is disrespectful of students

The first descriptor of the ineffective teacher to emerge from Table 4.10 above is *is disrespectful of* students. This finding is particularly interesting for three reasons. First, it represents a very close match in that it appeared with nearly the same frequency (14/13) in both students' and faculty's data from the open-ended question (Table 4.5). Second, supportive evidence is provided for my earlier argument in favour of the mixed-methodology approach to the questionnaire instrument wherein it was claimed that unforeseen and beneficial results can often be revealed by the use of qualitative methods. Third, it was indeed an unexpected result since I had not anticipated that lack of respect would be an issue raised by students in answering the open-ended question, especially where this study was conducted. The following excerpts from both student and faculty respondents appear to be representing the undercurrent of a potential problem brewing beneath the surface at the institute where this study was conducted. Students said:

> S1. The worst professor is someone who is hostile towards students and always suspicious.

S2. Ineffective university instructors enjoy humiliating students in his or her office.

S3. She/he is very rude and impolite and behaving bad with the students.

Teachers said:

F1. Disrespectful of culture and intolerant of differences.

F2. Being harsh and not respectful and arrogant.

F3. Ineffective teachers do not respect their students. They exploit the power in the teacher/student relationship to make students feel minuscule.

Having taught in this culture for the past twelve years, I have concluded that one of the most important needs in the eyes of Middle Eastern students from their teachers is respect – for themselves, their culture, their country, customs and religion. This point has also been observed by others who all conducted studies specific to the "Arab" culture (Saafin, 2005; Raymond, 2001; Parker, 1986; Radford, 1980). Lowman's ironic words link this finding back to the literature when he posits that, "Students may learn something important from a class in which the instructor shows a lack of respect or a negative and cynical attitude towards them, but it will be in spite of the teachers' attitude rather than because of it" (1995:19).

4.3.2 Does not care

The second noteworthy characteristic of ineffective teaching as reported by both students and faculty in this study is the affective quality of caring. From my own personal experience teaching students in the Gulf region, it has been my observation that students need to know that they are liked and valued as individuals both inside and outside the classroom to perform at their best. An uncaring instructor would most likely meet with resistance and minimal academic performance from his or her students. However, even though my observations stem mainly from teaching experience in a Middle Eastern context, it appears that this characteristic is not unique to the Gulf Region. Excerpts from participating students' and faculty's responses to the interview question, "In your opinion, what

constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching?" echo the important role "caring" plays in creating a better learning environment.

One IEP student said:

> The bad teacher is not concerned about the students.
>
> Researcher: What do you mean?
>
> IEP student: I mean he can't tell when someone is distracted in class because he doesn't care of this guy. For me I don't usually work hard for a teacher that doesn't care if I do my works or not … or doesn't ask me if I have a personal problem or not. Maybe I miss my family too much and I can't concentrate because maybe I have problem adjusting to the dorms, for example. That's what I mean … teacher who don't care about me is a poor teacher.

An engineering professor said:

> Hmmm!!! To tell you the truth, I have a well developed EQ, so for me an ineffective professor would be someone who didn't show his emotional side … who was uncaring, frigid, unfeeling, lacked compassion … actually, it's just the opposite of what I've just answered in question 1.
>
> Researcher: Are you saying that the characteristics of the effective professor are merely the opposite of the ineffective one?
>
> Professor: Essentially, yes!

Previous research on teaching excellence has established caring as an important factor in distinguishing between good and ineffective teaching. "Is concerned with, and is friendly to …" have been reported by other authors as an essential personality component (Saafin, 2005; Walls *et al.*, 2002; Beishuizen *et al.,* 2001; Miller *et al.*, 2001; Raymond, 2001; Witcher *et al.*, 2001; Donaldson & Flannery, 1993; Fernandez & Mateo, 1992; Donaldson, 1991; Ross-Gordon, 1991; Feldman, 1988; Radford, 1980). Caring therefore appears to be an important quality of excellent teachers judging from the aforementioned studies which were conducted around the globe, and from the consistency of responses from four population groups gathered in this study.

4.3.3 Is boring

A third attribute that was used by study respondents to elucidate what differentiates a good from an ineffective instructor is the characteristic of being boring. From the excerpts below extracted from both students and faculty, it becomes clear that an instructor's effort at making the subject come alive is an attribute the ineffective instructor either does not possess or does not attempt to cultivate. Interestingly, from the comments taken from the open-ended question in part C of the questionnaire, the common thread that emerged is that lecturing without involving students was used to paint a rather grim but succinct picture of the ineffective teacher. Students said:

> S1. Routine – always the same thing in class – only talks without giving time for answering questions or sharing in class.
>
> S2. The worst professor is one who talks and never listens to students – makes the class boring by doing the same thing every day.
>
> S3. The worst university professor makes the class sleepy because he doesn't let us participate.

Faculty had much the same thing to say:

> F1. Those who teach the same thing semester after semester, who do not try to improve the lessons to make them more interesting.
>
> F2. Lecturing to no end – telling students what they should know / memorize to pass the test. This is boring and not learning.
>
> F3. Being an absolute bore – reads and talks from a set text or course outline.
>
> F4. Dull, boring lecturer – not learning innovator – in fact, <u>all</u> my instructors at teacher training college in Bristol 1962-65!!

We have also seen the importance of bringing the subject matter to life as reported in the literature above, so there is no need to repeat this link at this point. However, across many studies reviewed in Chapter 2, the common prescriptions to sustain student attention and interest were: employing interesting activities, varying instructional delivery, and encouraging active learning by using teaching methods which involve students in their learning (Saafin, 2005; Raymond, 2001; Robertson, 1996; Stones, 1992; Chickering & Gamson, 1991; Feldman, 1988). Lowman (1995)

paints a clear picture of the importance of creating non-boring classroom situations: "Exemplary teaching is characterized by the stimulation of emotion associated with intellectual activity: the excitement of considering ideas, understanding abstract concepts and seizing their relevance to one's life, and participating in the process of discovery" (26).

4.3.4 Cannot explain well

One common depiction of the **ineffective** teacher that surfaced throughout the interviews of students and faculty was the inability of being able to explain a complex topic simply through the use of a lot of good examples. The following excerpts from the taped interviews illustrate this point.

One engineering student described ineffective teachers as follows:

> Don't explain the lesson well or they are not explaining the problem to be solved by giving useful … uh enough examples … they can't explain the lesson in an easy way … they teach continuously regardless of whether students are understanding the material or not … I really hate this type.

An IEP instructor said:

> Ah, I know that not everyone can be a brainiac teacher, but I think the ineffective teacher does not know the subject they are teaching and they find it hard to communicate it to students in a way they understand … ya … if they don't know their subject it becomes mechanical … in a nutshell, the poor teacher teaches what he/she is not capable of teaching.

This is consistent with Brookfield's (1990) argument discussed in the literature review, that effective teaching requires the professor to relate new concepts to something that is familiar to students. Thus it can be concluded that unless a teacher can explain his/her topic in a meaningful manner, effective learning will be unlikely to transpire in the classroom or lecture hall.

4.3.5 Is unprepared for class

Participating students and teachers in this study described ineffective faculty as being unprepared and disorganized. In the following interview excerpts, one engineering student recalls an ineffective professor he had, and voiced his dislike for unprepared educators:

Science Student:

> Usually after the first week I can judge whether the professor spends any time at all preparing his lessons. Some of my professors last semester … I … we … all my classmates had the same feeling … didn't prepare enough teaching materials. The materials sucked and you could feel that they just threw you bunches of info and in a very chaotic way. I think it's rude to be unprepared and disorganized especially in my major because you get nothing out of the lessons … not to mention the waste of time and money … . Ya! That's what I think!

One IEP faculty member reported:

> Ineffective teachers are ill prepared and do not have the ability to chunk information into manageable chunks … they lack infrastructure … uh … a lack of clarity of expectations of students … because this is new material for most students, it must be organized in a way that it makes sense to them … .

The common concern deduced from the taped interviews above from both students and faculty is that unless an instructor prepares and organizes instruction, feelings of frustration will quickly arise amongst students since learners will not have a clear sense of the priority and significance of the material being presented.

This finding is consistent with the discussion on research question 1 above relative to the predominant factors emerging from this study, one of which was the effective teacher as being well organized and prepared. Similarly, the importance of teacher preparedness and organization is one of the most common features of the effective teacher identified by both teachers and students in the literature reviewed. For example, Saafin (2005), Kyriacou (1998), Robertson (1996), Stones (1992), and Feldman (1988) would all agree that excellent teachers must be prepared and organized. If teachers fail to capitalize on this opportunity, students will rapidly lose

interest and respect, causing the teacher to resort to wielding power in an autocratic manner in order to maintain classroom order.

4.3.6 Is unfair in grading

Last in this discussion of features describing the ineffective teacher is being unfair with grades. Let us turn to some interview extracts from an engineering student and science professor to illustrate the consistency with this study finding to the literature. One engineering student stated:

> Yah … I think that those teachers who evaluate our work just from the way we look, from our face. Some teachers think that we locals don't have the ability of the other students … we are facing this problem in our majors … discrimination … . For example, one of my teachers couldn't believe that I could do such a good job on my lab assignment and I had to tell him; Sir, just because I'm wearing an abaya and I cover my hair doesn't mean that I don't have a mind. He feel embarrassed. And ahhh … also I don't like flexibility in the grading… some teachers mark depending on the students' faces … for example, some students are liked more than me … it doesn't mean that because I'm a female that I can't do the job. And that's it.

Obviously the professor this student was referring to unfortunately exhibited a low expectation of the Arab female student because of his prejudiced view. This finding was shocking as it made me realize that even at the very highest levels of education, ignorance in the form of stereotyping and male chauvinism can still exist.

An Engineering professor had this to say about faculty integrity during the taped interviews:

> Dishonest, insincere and unprofessional with the students.
>
> Researcher: Can you give me an example?
>
> Professor: Uh … marking according to nationality and not making their grading criteria transparent to students … that's quite unprofessional, in my opinion!

The common concern expressed by both students and faculty in my study is that ineffective teachers are not objective in assigning grades and exhibit

discriminatory behaviour. It is suggested that all students, regardless of race and gender, be marked objectively using pre-established grading criteria which are clearly communicated to students for transparency. Walls *et al.* (2002) describe the ineffective teacher, in addition to the aforementioned characteristics, as one who is unreasonable/unfair with assignments, tests and grades. Lowman (1995) validates this study's findings when he wrote, "Even students whose work is superior will become angry if testing and grading practices seem unfair" (26). The importance of fairness and impartiality in marking and evaluating students was mentioned by seven different authors in this study's literature review ranking amongst one of the highest (5^{th}) in degree of importance (Appendix 1) which serves to demonstrate how vital integrity is to teaching effectiveness.

To sum up, according to this study's respondents, ineffective teachers are: disrespectful of students, do not care, are boring, can not explain topics well, are unprepared for class and are unfair with their grading. What has resulted from examining the characteristics of ineffective teachers has produced mirror images of six of the nine traits that were considered predominant effective teaching measure by the same sample population. Four of the six personality items and two of the three ability traits are addressed. The missing ability characteristic *encourages students' questions and discussion*, however, could arguably be considered the opposite of the second highest ineffective teacher characteristic to emerge in Appendix 6 as one who doesn't care if students understand. Similarly, the first personality trait that did not have a direct mirror image in wording (show that they really like the subject they teach) could be countered by two ineffective teacher descriptors in Appendix 6 as is only interested in money, not teaching, and, is boring. The remaining personality trait (are friendly to students) that appears to not have a mirror image (in terms of wording) could also be countered with the wording is inaccessible as found in Appendix 6. Lowyck (in Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001) "… noticed that in every job with a strong social component qualities like friendliness are very opportune". Aloofness, it could be argued, would be a difficult approach taken to establishing friendly relationships with one's students in the communal environment of the classroom. Thus, this study's findings which reveal opposite portrayals of effective teaching used to describe ineffective teaching once again brings into question Walls

et al.'s (2002) claim that ineffective traits are not replicas of effective ones. The findings also provide validation of the study's methodology, purposely designed to attempt to measure effective teaching traits using an alternative method. However, comparable to the Walls *et al.* and others' studies, my findings also indicate that students and faculty hold similar perceptions of what characterizes an ineffective teacher.

4.4 Research question 4: Are the descriptors used to describe effective teaching amongst the four population groups focused more on the ability or on the personality view?

In the following discussion, four different sources of data will be discussed individually, comparisons will be made and conclusions drawn as to which attribute classification evolved as the more dominant from the perspectives of both faculty and student respondents in this study. However, one must recall that when research question 1 was discussed above, findings did reveal that six of the dominant attributes of effective teachers as perceived by this study's findings were personality traits, while three emerged as ability characteristics. Further, of the nine dominant qualities of effective teaching that were disclosed by my sample, the top three were personality traits (Appendix 19). And as just discussed while answering research question 3, four of the six traits that could arguably be used as mirror images of effective teachers materialized as personality characteristics.

4.4.1 Questionnaire

Of the 25 questionnaire items utilized to evaluate respondents' opinions of effective teaching characteristics, 11 were purposely designed to reflect personality traits while 14 were included to measure ability characteristics (see earlier discussion in Chapter 3).

The average means of the personality measure was calculated as 3.37 whereas the average means of the ability category was less at 2.89 (Appendix 19). Therefore, according to study respondents, the personality measure was the more predominant of the two. In addition, by examining column one in Table 4.12 below which represents findings from four different sources, four of the top six ranked traits are personality characteristics, and of these six, the top ranked three are all personality.

Clearly, personality measures were rated as more important than ability measures by the current investigation's findings as discovered by analyzing the data emerging from the 25 questionnaire items.

Table 4.12
A comparison of the six highest ranked characteristics of effective teaching across four sources

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Questionnaire (Appendix 20)	**Transcribed interviews (Appendix 5)**	**Open-ended question (Table 4.2)**	**Literature review (Appendix 1)**
1. Are respectful of their students.	1. Makes lessons understandable	***1. Makes class interesting/fun***	***1. Is enthusiastic for subject/towards teaching***
2. Make classes interesting.	***2. Is friendly to students***	***2. Is friendly to students***	***1. Is available to help students***
3. Are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	***2. Respects students***	3. Really knows subject knowledge	***2. Is concerned with, is friendly to, and respects students***
4. Encourage students' questions and discussion.	***3. Encourages students***	***4. Cares about students' learning***	***2. Is open to students' opinions, ideas and discussion***
5. Are always well prepared and organized.	***4. Makes classes interesting/fun***	5. Makes lessons understandable	***3. Stimulates interest in course/subject***
6. Care about students succeeding in their course.	5. Makes students think	6. Is well prepared for class	3. Encourages students to think critically
	6. Answers all students question		4. Is prepared, organized
	6. Really knows subject knowledge		4. Is knowledgeable of subject
			4. Explains using simple terms
			5. Is sensitive to and concerned with class level and progress
			5. Is fair and impartial in marking/evaluating students
			6. Provides frequent, prompt, useful feedback
			6. Is dedicated, committed

Note: personality measures are highlighted in italicized bold font.

4.4.2 Transcribed interviews

By referring to Appendix 5, it can be observed that from the transcribed interviews of study respondents, 54% of the traits mentioned by faculty and student respondents were attributed to personality measures while the remaining 46% were categorized as ability, indicating that when verbally discussing effective teaching traits, respondents in this study slightly favoured personality traits. In addition, by referring to column two in Table 4.12 above which has extracted data contained in Appendix 5, four of the top six ranked traits are listed as personality measures.

4.4.3 Open-ended question

Of the two comparative measures, personality traits were indicated to be more dominant than ability characteristics when both faculty and student respondents described the characteristics of the excellent instructor/professor in the open-ended question (Table 4.2). Out of the 46 attributes which were synthesized, 71% were classified as personality characteristics while ability characteristics occupied the remaining 29% of the total characteristics extracted from Part C of the questionnaire. As can be seen from column three in Table 4.12 above, personality measures occupy the top two of the first six characteristics reported in the open-ended question found in Part C of the questionnaire. Consistent with the results of the questionnaire and with the transcribed interviews, personality measures are once again indicated by the study respondents to be the more frequently mentioned of the two.

4.4.4 Literature review

As discussed earlier, Appendix 1 was created to categorize effective teaching characteristics emerging from the literature review into either ability or personality. Of the 77 characteristics listed, 67.5% (52) fall under the ability rating while 32.5% (25) of the characteristics of the excellent teacher are allocated to personality traits. Table 4.13 below simplifies Appendix 1 by indicating the number of authors who specifically mentioned a particular trait as being essential to effective teaching. This

allows us to see the more dominant of the two when examining the most frequently mentioned attributes.

Table 4.13
Counts of authors who mentioned a specific ability or personality characteristic in the literature review (Extracted from Appendix 1)

Number of authors who mentioned this trait	Trait	Ability (A) or Personality (P)
14	***Is enthusiastic for subject/towards teaching***	***P***
14	***Is available to help students***	***P***
13	***Is concerned with, is friendly to, and respects students***	***P***
13	***Is open to students' opinions, ideas and discussion***	***P***
11	***Stimulates interest in the course/subject***	***P***
11	Is prepared/organized	A
10	Is knowledgeable of subject	A
10	Explains using simple terms	A
10	Encourages students to think critically	A
9	***Is sensitive to and concerned with class level and progress***	***P***
9	***Is fair and impartial in marking/evaluating students***	***P***

What can be observed from Table 4.13 is that six of the top ten characteristics used in the literature to describe excellent quality teaching in the opinions of students and faculty across many diverse cultures and of various age and status rankings are personality traits. Additionally, the first five highest ranked traits on this list are personality traits. The finding that personality traits ranked highest in the literature review list is consistent with Pine & Boy's assertion that "Pupils feel the personal emotional structure of the teacher long before they feel the impact of the intellectual content offered by that teacher" (in Williams & Burden, 1997:62). Furthermore, in other studies concerned with teaching excellence, researchers have reported that respondents (both teachers and students) tend to focus on personality factors more prominently than on ability factors, irrespective of level, age, nationality, and academic discipline (Walls *et al.*, 2002; Witcher *et al.*, 2001). Finally, by referring back to the literature review column 4 of Table 4.12 above which simplifies the findings in Appendix 1, it can be observed that the most frequently mentioned factors in the literature used in determining excellent quality

teaching in the opinions of students and faculty across many diverse cultures and of various age and status rankings are personality traits. Consistency in the higher importance placed on personality traits arising from the questionnaire results, transcribed interviews, the open-ended questions, and in the literature has been demonstrated.

4.5 Research question 5: To what extent do mediating factors such as academic discipline and participants' gender have an effect on the portrait of the excellent teacher?

To answer this question, Chi-square test for association at the significant level (α=0.05) was used. Only items of significant association (less than 0.05) are presented in the tables that follow. Significant association can be interpreted as major disagreement on the level of importance associated amongst the four population groups as to how they rated the 25 questionnaire items on a four-point scale of not important (NI) to very important (VI). Personality and ability measures are discussed independently in what follows.

4.5.1 Personality as a mediating factor

Table 4.14 below extracts from Appendix 30 four significant associations resulting from Chi-square analysis of the 11 questionnaire items categorized as personality traits of excellent teachers.

Table 4.14
Chi-square test for association between the academic discipline and importance at significant level (α=0.05) on the personality characteristics measure

Academic Discipline*	Importance Level: Not Important N	Not Important %	Somewhat Important N	Somewhat Important %	Important N	Important %	Very Important N	Very Important %	Chi Value Sig.
4. … use humour in the classroom.									
EF	0	0.0	7	19.4	19	52.8	10	27.8	19.526
SF	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	53.6	13	46.4	.021
ES	2	4.5	12	27.3	13	29.5	17	38.6	
SS	0	0.0	9	36.0	10	40.0	6	24.0	
6. … are friendly to students.									
EF	0	0.0	3	8.3	16	44.4	17	47.2	26.493
SF	0	0.0	6	21.4	7	25.0	15	53.6	.002
ES	0	0.0	3	6.8	5	11.4	36	81.8	
SS	2	8.0	1	4.0	7	28.0	15	60.0	
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.									
EF	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.3	33	91.7	19.367
SF	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	14.3	24	85.7	.022
ES	1	2.3	5	11.4	14	31.8	24	54.5	
SS	0	0.0	2	8.0	6	24.0	17	68.0	
25. … have a unique teaching style.									
EF	18	50.0	10	27.8	7	19.4	1	2.8	56.006
SF	7	25.0	14	50.0	6	21.4	1	3.6	.000
ES	3	6.8	4	9.1	20	45.5	17	38.6	
SS	1	4.0	8	32.0	8	32.0	8	32.0	

*Academic Discipline: **EF** = English faculty, **SF** = science faculty, **ES** = English students, **SS** = science students.

Item 4, "use humour in the classroom", reveals that amongst the four population groups, differences existed between students' and faculty's opinions on the use of humour in the classroom. All science faculty members in particular rated this personality trait as either important or as very important. English students' low rating of the use of humour in the classroom perhaps reflects their inadequacy in understanding humour conducted in a second language. In order to understand humour, a high level of the language as well as advanced cultural awareness is required; both are skills the English students acquire in the intensive English program. Science faculty members on the other hand indicated a tendency to utilize humour as an appropriate means to stimulate interest in their students or to bring their scientific topics to life. The use of appropriate humour in the classroom, therefore, can be interpreted from this study's findings as an indicator of effective teaching.

The second personality item to result in significant association, questionnaire item 6, "are friendly to students" was most likely caused by two science student participants who claimed that friendliness of faculty was not an important trait of effective teaching. This anomaly occurring with a small sample size in all probability skewed the results since the majority of all respondent groups and sub-groups clearly indicated that being friendly to students was an important or very important trait that should be exhibited by effective teachers.

Questionnaire item 20, "are fair in grading and evaluating student work" indicated a disparity between faculty and students. For all faculty members, there was no compromise on the importance of being fair and objective when grading or evaluating student work. However, English students in particular appear to have caused the significant association to occur with this trait measurement, most probably due to their inexperience with the concept that faculty base student evaluations on their efforts as opposed to their nationality, status or family name. This trait has already been discussed extensively above.

Ratings of questionnaire item 25, "have a unique teaching style", produced interesting results. Faculty members are split nearly equally across the full spectrum of the four Likert-scale ratings in their opinions of the importance of having their own teaching style. Students, on the other hand, leaned towards higher ratings of teachers who demonstrated uniqueness in their teaching style. This was especially important to English students who perhaps enjoy diversity in approach (entertainment) since they have not yet entered their majors and are limited to learning the four English language skills. To a lesser degree, though still important, science students also appear to prefer professors who employ a quality of uniqueness in their teaching approach. The slight difference between the two student groups could possibly be attributed to the science students being exposed to a wider variety of subjects under the encompassing umbrella of "science". Thus, teachers who demonstrate an inimitable teaching style could possibly be rated higher than teachers who conform to standard "chalk and talk" teaching routines, according to the student respondents in this study. Let us now examine the significant associations that emerge from the degree of importance reported with respect to the ability measure.

4.5.2 Ability as a mediating factor

Table 4.15 below extracts from Appendix 31 significant associations resulting from Chi-square analysis of the 14 questionnaire items categorized as ability traits of excellent teachers.

Table 4.15

Chi-square test for association between the academic discipline and importance at significant level (α=0.05) on the ability characteristics measure

Academic Discipline	Importance Level								Chi Value
	Not Important		Somewhat Important		Important		Very Important		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Sig.
3. … give many quizzes and tests.									
EF	4	11.1	19	52.8	12	33.3	1	2.8	19.353
SF	9	32.1	13	46.4	6	21.4	0	.0	.022
ES	4	9.1	14	31.8	20	45.5	6	13.6	
SS	2	8.0	13	52.0	8	32.0	2	8.0	
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.									
EF	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	16.7	30	83.3	24.430
SF	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.1	26	92.9	.004
ES	1	2.3	1	2.3	16	36.4	26	59.1	
SS	1	4.0	3	12.0	9	36.0	12	48.0	
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.									
EF	8	22.2	15	41.7	10	27.8	3	8.3	18.533
SF	8	28.6	10	35.7	8	28.6	2	7.1	.029
ES	5	11.4	13	29.5	16	36.4	10	22.7	
SS	1	4.0	7	28.0	7	28.0	10	40.0	
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.									
EF	35	97.2	0	0.0	1	2.8	0	0.0	71.749
SF	25	89.3	1	3.6	2	7.1	0	0.0	.000
ES	9	20.5	16	36.4	18	40.9	1	2.3	
SS	6	24.0	10	40.0	8	32.0	1	4.0	
15. … require students to think critically.									
EF	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	44.4	20	55.6	22.378
SF	0	0.0	1	3.6	5	17.9	22	78.6	.008
ES	1	2.3	5	11.4	25	56.8	13	29.5	
SS	1	4.0	3	12.0	10	40.0	11	44.0	
21. … have many years of teaching experience.									
EF	9	25.0	23	63.9	3	8.3	1	2.8	28.188
SF	13	46.4	10	35.7	5	17.9	0	0.0	.001
ES	5	11.4	19	43.2	10	22.7	10	22.7	
SS	7	28.0	7	28.0	5	20.0	6	24.0	
24. … assign a lot of homework.									
EF	9	25.0	15	41.7	11	30.6	1	2.8	21.118
SF	14	50.0	12	42.9	2	7.1	0	0.0	.012
ES	8	18.2	25	56.8	10	22.7	1	2.3	
SS	1	4.0	18	72.0	5	20.0	1	4.0	

As indicated in Table 4.15 above, seven (50%) of the 14 ability traits indicate a significant association. Item 3, "give many quizzes and tests" was considered a more important ability characteristic to both student groups than it did to the two faculty groups as we have seen earlier in this discussion. English students indicated that they prefer frequent testing more so than did their science student counterparts. One possible explanation for this could be that English students are tested frequently by their teachers not only to give them practice in taking tests, but also to help them get accustomed to studying daily as opposed to cramming the night before the exam occurs. In addition, English faculty tend to test their students weekly as a means to review and reinforce materials taught earlier, and to help this knowledge transfer to students' long-term memory.

Item 5, "encourage students' questions and discussion", produced a difference of opinion between science students and other respondent types. While the entire faculty group rated this trait as either an important or very important characteristic of excellent teaching, some science students on the other hand rated this trait as only somewhat important or as not important. One possible explanation for this difference could be that science classes are generally delivered in huge lecture halls with large numbers of students who become passive, note-taking learners, as opposed to English classes which are purposely restricted to smaller numbers and where students are engaged in two-way instruction as a part of their English skills development.

Faculty members considered questionnaire item 11, the ability "use the latest computer technology in their teaching" to be a less important determinant of excellent teaching than did students of both disciplines. English students and particularly science students rated the use of computer technology much higher than did their instructors. Saafin's (2005) student respondents also expressed the view that the use of computer technology in teaching English assisted the teachers to be more effective. He argued that students' motivation for learning was enhanced when the students were given the opportunity to "… go to the computer labs and use computers …" to learn new materials (2005: 132). One plausible explanation for this difference in view could be that students are more attuned to technological advancements than their teachers, see the use of computer programs as fun and

entertaining, and would therefore like to see this technology being put to more use in the classrooms to help them assimilate their materials.

English faculty and science faculty both highly agreed that it was not an indicator of effective teaching if one were to "lecture (talk) for the entire class period" (item 13, Table 4.15), while some students tended to rate lecturing as slightly more important. The finding that 41% of the English students rated lecturing as important is surprising, since language teachers minimize the use of lecturing techniques and instead encourage two-way communication with their students as a means of enabling students to practice what they have learned in the classroom. There are two possible explanations for this finding; either the English students did not fully comprehend the question item, despite the re-designing attempts described in Chapter 3, or the students are inexperienced with this method of instruction and are anticipating with excitement entering into their majors where they believe lecturing is how higher education is conducted.

Both faculty sub-groups rated the ability "require students to think critically" (Table 4.15, item 15) as important or very important, though surprisingly one science faculty member rated thinking outside of the box as only somewhat important. Another divergence appears to be caused by students (one from each sub-group) who rated this trait as not important. One explanation could be that the English student did not understand the question; is it also possible that both students who rated the development of critical thinking as not important were not accustomed to critiquing anything their teachers told them while attending their formative years in school.

A contradiction occurred on the ratings of item 21 (Table 4.15), "have many years of teaching experience", with no agreement on one importance level indicated. What is interesting with these results is the difference in opinion between students and faculty, as well as other subtle differences. Most of the English faculty (97%) originate from Western countries, as do a very high percentage (93%) of the science faculty. Teaching experience and age appear to have a lower priority with these study participants. However, respect for elders is an important cultural value in the

Middle East, so this perhaps explains the disparity in views between faculty (mostly Western) and students (primarily Middle Eastern) on this characteristic.

The last significant association between the ability characteristics and the academic discipline occurred with questionnaire item 24, "assign a lot of homework" (Table 4.15). Science faculty in particular did not consider this trait as an indicator of effective teaching. This is hardly surprising, given that science professors teach large classes and are required to conduct research as well as assume other responsibilities. Given this workload and working condition, marking large numbers of students' homework assignments would be a difficult if not impossible requirement. English teachers, on the other hand, were less united in their perspectives of this trait; surprisingly, 63% of the English faculty expressed the view that assigning a considerable amount of homework was either not important or only somewhat important. Since the program they teach is an "intensive" English program of 5-hours per day and 5-days each week, many instructors may feel that it would be excessive to assign additional homework to their students. Furthermore, as compared to the science students, English students are generally younger, less experienced with university life, and therefore require more guardianship. However, when examining students' views of the relationship of assigning a lot of homework to excellent teachers, another surprise comes to light: both groups of students rated this characteristic as either not important or as only somewhat important. Even more remarkable is the 1% difference between the two sub-groups (English students 75%, science students 76%). With science students, this would make sense: in their majors, as discussed above, their professors simply have no time to mark large volumes of homework, and therefore science students are expected to assume responsibility for their own learning. The only explanation I can offer for the high number of English students not valuing teachers who assign a lot of homework is the obvious one – most students in an intensive English program don't like to have to do additional work outside of class, perhaps because they have little energy left for homework after spending a whole day working with the same topic, or they simply don't appreciate the value of extra practice.

4.5.3 Gender as a mediating factor

Only one characteristic resulted in a significant difference of opinion based on participants' gender. Table 4.16 below indicates that female respondents rated the importance of making classes interesting as less important than did their male counterparts. One explanation for this could be that the female students are more engaged with their learning, which helps them to be more self-motivated than males, thus requiring less entertainment in the classroom to maintain attention to what the teacher is striving to offer them.

Table 4.16
Chi-square test for association between the respondent gender and importance at significant level (α=0.05) on the personality characteristics measure

	Importance Level								Chi Value
Gender	Not Important		Somewhat Important		Important		Very Important		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Sig.
1. … make classes interesting.									
Male	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	21.1	71	78.9	8.787
Female	1	2.3	1	2.3	16	37.2	25	58.1	.032

This differs from Donaldson & Flannery (1993), who reported that female student respondents rated instructor's flexibility and acting as a good role model more important than did the male students while Witcher *et al.* (2001) discovered "student centeredness" to be more important to the female student respondents. Moreover, in his earlier study in the UAE on a "similar population" to his 2005 study, Saafin "… found no significant differences between the perspectives of males and females on effective EFL teaching" (2005:22). This is consistent with the study conducted by Fernandez & Mateo (1992) in Spain where no significant differences between male and female students were observed. Hence, even though my study revealed one uniquely significant difference between female and male student opinions on the trait "makes classes interesting", further research could be conducted on larger sample sizes in order to determine if differences of opinion between male and female students in the Gulf can be identified as unique or, on the other hand, linked to other researchers' efforts in the same region. What follows next in Chapter 5 is a summary of the findings related to the literature and to the current investigation, conclusions and recommendations arising from this research.

CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter briefly summarizes the major findings of this study related back to the literature review and in response to the five research questions and the three hypotheses raised by this study. Following the findings summary section, conclusions relevant to the context and participants in this study will be discussed. Implications/suggestions which may help transfer the findings of this study to a wider context will be presented. Finally, a brief discussion on problematizing this study will be followed with a summary of personal reflections.

5.2 Summary of the findings

The findings from this study are categorized and summarized in the following sections: findings related to the literature review, findings related to the research questions, and findings related to the study hypotheses.

5.2.1 Findings related to the literature

The literature reviewed supports the view that student opinions of teaching effectiveness are a valid, increasingly exploited, and acceptable source of information in determining instructional performance. Furthermore, it validates the use of classification by personality and ability as a commonly accepted method for examining effective teaching characteristics since respondents tend to categorize effective teaching using these two dimensions, and that the personality measures are the higher ranked of the two categories. In addition, throughout the literature it has been noted not only that similarities in perceptions of effective teaching do exist between students and faculty, but also that some differences persist based upon factors such as student age, status and gender. Important personality traits used to describe effective teaching are the following: is enthusiastic towards teaching the

subject, is available to students, respects and is friendly to students, is open to students' ideas and opinions, stimulates interest in the topic, is sensitive and concerned with students' progress and is objective in evaluating students. Predominant ability attributes used to describe effective teachers are being well prepared and organized, possessing subject knowledge, being able to explain difficult subjects using simple terms, and encouraging students to think critically.

From the current study, since respondents indicated no objection to the use of the personality and ability descriptors used in the questionnaire instrument, it can be argued that students and faculty do tend to categorize effective teaching characteristics under personality and ability traits, and thus consistency with the literature is demonstrated by this study's respondents. Though it has been acknowledged through this paper that there are other approaches to categorizing effective teacher attributes, the personality and ability classification has been adhered to. The personality view is essentially a moral view of human nature which espouses an array of humanistic values which make for effective relationships in society. Some argue that 'personality" traits are innate, such as those found in leaders and effective teachers, but would also acknowledge that these traits can be learned and refined through teacher training programs, professional development and continuous life-long learning. The ability view, in contrast, is predicated on objective evidence that there are certain identifiable characteristics which are effective in certain situations, such as in the classroom. Ability attributes or skills are based upon the scientific view that humans have certain cognitive, measurable attributes. Findings from this study (research Question 4) indicate that study respondents, similar to those examined in the literature review, have used descriptors of effective teaching characteristics more focused on the personality view. However, the fact that ability attributes run closely behind personality traits remind us that both are crucial and are not mutually exclusive to the difficult task of describing the excellent teacher.

The findings of this study support the results of previous studies on teaching effectiveness which demonstrate that many traits or practices are common, regardless of culture, age, and/or academic discipline. It also supports the literature findings of relatively high correlations between students and faculty in what they

appreciate in teachers and that student opinions are of value. In other words, the participating students and faculty each appear to have an image in mind of what ideal instructors are like and how they conduct themselves and what they do both in the classroom and outside, which differentiates them from ineffective instructors. These ideal images in most cases matched the portrait of the good teacher painted by many participating students and faculty in academic programs from many corners of the globe.

5.2.2 Findings related to the research questions

Results from research Question 1 which attempted to capture predominant characteristics of effective teachers have revealed that all of the predominant personality and ability measures used by this study's respondents to describe excellent teaching coincide with principal characteristics revealed in the literature review. Common personality characteristics of effective teaching therefore appear to be: demonstrating respect to students, delivering interesting classes, caring about students' welfare, exhibiting a love for the subject being taught, and being friendly to students. Common ability attributes of excellent teaching are demonstrated by educators who encourage two-way communication with students, are organized and well-prepared, and present topics in ways that students can relate to and easily understand.

What the above suggests is that despite the fact that there is concurrence to a certain extent on the importance of the 25 traits included in the survey instrument and that all four population groups do tend to use comparable descriptors in open-ended questions to describe excellent teaching, differences of view persist. Faculty members who are aware of students' expectations and are willing to amend their behaviours based on student feedback are armed with important knowledge to dismantle walls of miscommunication. This is not to infer that teachers must bow to the wishes of their students; rather if science professors, for instance, were to explain to their students why they do not give students many tests, nor assign lots of homework, and prefer to interact with their students rather than just lecturing to them, mistaken perceptions could be reduced. Similarly, if English students were

taught at the beginning of their first semester in the IEP program what to expect from their instructors and how they were being graded, differences of opinion could be diminished. Improved communication and understanding between students and faculty will enhance classroom environments, lead to higher instructor ratings, augment knowledge transfer, improve retention of students and ultimately, boost institute reputation and image.

Research Questions 2 and 3 examined the degree to which student perceptions of effective and ineffective teachers are similar to faculty perceptions. The two questions, to be discussed jointly, were included in this study to attempt to determine if differences in opinion exist at the institute under study between faculty and student respondents in their opinions of what constitutes effective and ineffective teaching. Question 3 was purposely designed to assess respondents' opinions to determine if mirror images of the effective teacher were held by study respondents as well as to determine effective attributes from an alternate approach. Only two personality traits appear to have raised significant differences of opinion between the study's four population groups. Science faculty rated the use of humour in the classroom to be an essential ingredient to effective teaching while in contrast, English students, with less developed English language skills needed to interpret humour, understandably placed a low value on this quality. On the other hand, what was important to both student groups was that instructors should demonstrate a unique teaching style whereas faculty indicated no consensus of opinion on this personality trait. Having a unique teaching style is perhaps being expressed by new, inexperienced students who are expecting to be entertained in the classroom or, conversely, in fact do learn more effectively from teachers who vary their instructional delivery. This leads us to the suggestion that teachers and professors who employ a variety of methods of communication in the classroom may concurrently improve knowledge transfer and secure higher student ratings on their assessments.

Frequent testing was viewed as being more important by students, in particular English students, than it was by all faculty members. English students in particular are tested frequently in their preparation program, and have thus perhaps become accustomed to having recurrent opportunities to assess their newly acquired

knowledge. Anticipating many tests from their instructors is possibly another indicator of inexperience with the university system being expressed by students, who possibly look to this trait as an avenue for closer contact and more guidance by their teachers. All study respondents, however, were consistent in their opinions that assigning a lot of homework was not necessarily an indicator of excellent teaching.

Both faculty groups viewed the use of the most recent technological tools as being less important than did their charges. It was interesting to see how students view the use of computer technology as more important than their instructors. This finding may reflect that faculty are lagging behind their students in the ever-moving application of computer software. Faculty members interested in enhancing their instructional skills and in attaining higher evaluation scores could consider upgrading their technological skills and applying the benefits of their newly acquired skills and techniques in the classroom. Another explanation for the difference in view over the use of technology in the classroom could be that the younger generation have become more comfortable with interacting with humans through the medium of the internet and Blackberry modes of communication rather than face-to-face encounters, a potential source of future research.

All faculty members agreed that lecturing was not an indicator of excellent teaching. Expressing the expectation of students to interact in two-way dialogue by the faculty at this institute where the survey was conducted was encouraging to see, since as we have learned above, lecturing is not viewed as a favourable method of effective teaching according to both the literature results and this study's respondents. The lower rating of this trait by students is probably once again an example of students' inexperience with this manner of communication, and with their expectation or misconception that university classes are of the lecture format.

Participating students and teachers agreed on a number of characteristics they believed distinguished the effective from the ineffective university instructor. Both students and faculty regarded the affective quality to treat learners with respect and caring as very important. The participating teachers' and students' perceptions also correspond with regard to making classes interesting, caring about their students'

success, demonstrating a love for teaching and being friendly. In addition to the five personality characteristics listed above, three ability attributes were also stressed as being very important to all participants: encouraging students' questions, being well-prepared and organized, and having a knack for making difficult subjects understandable. Thus, according to these study participants, both skills and affective factors are necessary virtues to paint a portrait of the effective university instructor. As we have seen above, all of these personality and ability factors used to describe excellent teaching were highly compatible with the literature reviewed for this paper.

Conversely, faculty rated as more important than students the ability to think critically, being fair in grading, encouraging students' questions and discussion, and expecting students to become independent learners. This is a potentially important finding and it is tempting to conclude that teachers' judgements of effectiveness are founded on strong pedagogical principles and the acquisition of a more global view of education learned in their teacher training and professional development programs. Critical thinking is high on Benjamin Bloom's taxonomy (1984) and awareness of this cognitive domain hierarchy is no doubt discussed in any teacher preparatory program. The development of these skills would also have been experienced by teacher trainees who have walked the path towards higher level thinking on their way to becoming teachers and independent learners. Students, especially undergraduates, on the other hand, are progressing up the higher-order levels from simple recall to being able to independently evaluate the value of ideas based on some benchmark or standard – target skills required for higher order and independent thinking in all academic disciplines. Similarly, grading students' work objectively, I would argue, would be another fundamental ingredient included in teacher training programs. However, it is also possible that teacher/professor respondents in this study place more emphasis on teaching characteristics which are included in their annual evaluations, or on those they believe are expected of them to deliver. Once again student inexperience or unfamiliarity with this concept may have caused this difference of opinion to appear.

According to this study's respondents, ineffective teachers are: disrespectful of students, do not care, are boring, can not explain topics well, are unprepared for

class and are unfair with their grading. What has resulted from examining the characteristics of ineffective teachers has produced mirror images of most of the traits that were considered predominant effective teaching measure by the same sample population. This finding helps to bring into question Walls *et al.*'s (2002) claim that ineffective traits are not replicas of effective ones, and also provides validation of my study methodology, purposely designed to measure effective teaching traits using an alternative method. However, comparable to the Walls *et al.* study, my findings also indicate that students and faculty hold similar perceptions of what characterizes an ineffective teacher.

Research Question 5 was included in this study in an attempt to determine if mediating factors such as academic discipline and gender would impact respondents' portrait of the effective instructor. One conflict of opinion occurred between students and faculty in their opinions of the value of teaching experience and age of the teacher. Students (mostly from the Gulf region) ranked this ability trait much higher than did faculty members (mostly from the West), suggesting that cultural values may still play an important part in the teacher-student relationship. Finally, a gender difference appeared over the issue of valuing teachers who demonstrate the ability to make classes interesting: female respondents did not view this to be as important as did their male counterparts.

5.2.3 Findings related to the study hypotheses

Results from the above analysis have verified the expectations that were put forward in Chapter 3 of this study. First, it may be concluded that students and faculty maintain remarkably similar views of what constitutes effective teaching, but as predicted, differences in opinion still exist based upon factors such as respondents' age, origins and program of study. Second, the results of this study have revealed that, consistent with the literature findings, respect, teacher openness, approachability, flexibility and demonstrating that they like their students are critical attributes to the overall description of effective teaching. And last, though two attributes are commonly used to describe effectiveness in teaching, personality traits

in this study as well as in the literature are more predominantly referred to than ability skills.

5.2.4 Summary of findings

The findings of this study conducted in the Arabian Gulf region are consistent with past research conducted not only in a similar Gulf setting, but also with research conducted at various locations around the globe. Findings support a widespread view that certain personality and ability traits are critical to effective teaching. Both personality and ability characteristics are used by respondents in describing effective and ineffective teaching, with personality traits appearing to be the more important of the two. In addition, a high degree of concurrence exists between what both faculty and students consider to be effective teaching. Most faculty respondents appear to be aware of their students' expectations of requisite ingredients for teaching excellence. Furthermore, it is clear that students from different disciplines use similar measuring criteria to evaluate their teachers and professors, and that these criteria, as mentioned above, are consistent with those used by their teachers. Some evidence has also been uncovered to support the view that ineffective teaching is the mirror image of effective teaching.

5.3 Recommendations

This section is discussed in three parts. It outlines the teaching implications based on the findings of this study. Next, implications for administrators and teacher trainers will be detailed, and last, it will offer suggestions for future research.

5.3.1 Teaching implications

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made.

First, induction programs for new faculty entering university and college English departments in the Gulf region should include a discussion of the impact of established, objective and unalterable evaluation and grading procedures on new students who might be unfamiliar with this approach. Vital communications such as this could avoid potential conflict with students receiving their mid- or first semester grades, and thus improve classroom relationships. In addition, this finding serves as a reminder to all university faculty of the importance in establishing, communicating, and adhering to a transparent yet objective grading system, and that this objectivity is considered to be an important trait of effective teaching in the eyes of students and faculty alike.

Second, if more professors and instructors can be made aware that students' perceptions of excellent teaching are similar to their own, and are considered to be valid by researchers worldwide, faculty could benefit from considering rather than rejecting student feedback when evaluating their teaching performance. This is particularly important in light of the prevailing use of student evaluations in determining not only faculty performance but also as a basis for contract renewals and/or salary increments. Specific to teaching implications, awareness of the similarity in how students and faculty view effective teaching may help faculty in various disciplines, such as science and English, to consider their students' specific needs and help them to amend their teaching styles or methods accordingly to better serve their students. In this manner, potential tensions found in some university and college classrooms could be reduced or even eliminated. Making public the results of this research project could have a positive and practical effect on practicing as well as prospective teachers as they prepare to meet the challenges of effective teaching and provide them with notions of how to improve their teaching.

Since this study was conducted in what might be referred to as an Arab culture, i.e. a country in which the Arabic language is the lingua franca, and the Islamic religion is almost universally practised, it is hoped that this undertaking will serve as a resource for any teacher from another culture striving to adapt to the needs of students in the Gulf-region. "We must enter, not evade, the tangles of teaching so we can understand them better and negotiate them with more grace, not only to

guard our own spirits but also to serve our students well" (Palmer, 1998:2). It is also hoped that this thesis will help other researchers wishing to further explore Gulf Arab students' perceptions of the effective/ineffective teacher. Should results of this thesis be published, highly motivated faculty would have access to a resource that they could use to become better teachers on their own. Information resulting from this study such as the traits of effective teachers accumulated in Appendix 1 could be condensed into a teacher's self-assessment check list to help faculty who are interested in maintaining professional growth.

5.3.2 Administrative and teacher training program implications

There are a number of implications raised by this study which could benefit administrators and teacher training program developers.

First, this study could provide post-secondary policy makers with an applicable list of effective teaching characteristics to help them design appropriate, sensitive and reliable instruments to evaluate and encourage teaching effectiveness of their faculty. Since both student and faculty perspectives have been ranked in order of importance, a valid evaluation form of teaching effectiveness used by students and administrators to evaluate their faculty could be developed. If the same form is used by both administration and students to rate teachers, faculty might more seriously consider student feedback, administrators could become more enlightened as to the constantly evolving demands of the classroom environment, and thus validity of the evaluation instrument could be ensured.

Second, attributes of what constitutes excellent teaching in the eyes of the adult students specific to the institute where this study was conducted could become a valuable part of recruitment and in-service offerings. Providing such information and training to new and/or adjunct faculty as well as to veteran faculty with consistently low student ratings could contribute to student satisfaction and improved learning, better faculty performance, institute reputation for the provision of service excellence, and improved student retention.

Third, this study may impart valuable information to teacher training and program curriculum development specialists by providing them with the results of university students' and faculty's perspectives in a Middle-East environment to guide them in creating more effective and culturally sensitive training programs. Equally important, if the attributes of what is required to be an effective teacher are made available to candidates considering the teaching profession prior to their commitment to the program, frustration, loss of self-esteem and waste of time and money could be reduced. Similarly, attrition rates from teacher training programs could be reduced if job performance criteria were made transparent to potential teachers prior to their commitment to the program.

Fourth, results of this study could be used in induction programs aimed at developing those who have entered the field of teaching via alternative routes, rather than through teacher education certification. Proper preparation for doctoral candidates entering the classroom environment as an instructor for the first time could include not only what constitutes effective teaching and as well as instruction and training on how to aspire to those characteristics, but also create an awareness that student perceptions are similar to faculty perceptions and are considered in research to be valid. In addition, the results of this study could also be used to develop workshops to disseminate information on what constitutes effective teaching throughout the Gulf region and made available to all who opted to attend.

Finally, results of this study could be used in student induction programs to help new students to the university setting understand what is expected of them, how classes are conducted, and how teachers from other cultures may have different expectations and ways of dealing with students.

5.3.3 Future research implications

As a result of this study, implications for further studies are primarily to form a credible basis for the benefit of future researchers attempting to advance the understanding of excellent teaching characteristics from the perspectives of both students and faculty. It is hoped that this study may help fill the gap in the paucity of research on university students' conceptions versus faculty's perceptions of teaching excellence in a university setting in the Gulf region. This is just an initial step, however. Once more substantial evidence is gathered and analysed, it would be of benefit for practitioners to learn how or if resulting differences of opinion between students and faculty actually impact teaching and learning. This would naturally lead to further studies designed to reduce mismatches, with the ultimate objective of improving teaching effectiveness.

In addition, continuous studies should be conducted to help us remain current with shifting student and faculty perspectives of effective teaching, as these views appear to change over time. Especially of interest and arising from this study is the application of computer technology in the classroom. Another potential topic of future research could be to identify what types of technology students are using in their daily lives, and to discover if applications of that technology could be utilized in the classroom. Comparisons of teaching effectiveness between faculty users and non-users of the current technology could be researched. Similarly, before and after effects of teacher classroom effectiveness could be conducted on teachers who attend upgrading workshops on the use of technological tools in their teaching.

What also could be examined is to determine if student views of effective teaching become more compatible with faculty views as students approach matriculation. And finally, another topic for future research is the question of grading objectivity. Studies could be conducted to determine if, or how, the changing demographics of teachers in the primary and secondary school system in the UAE will have an impact on this topic.

5.4 Problematizing the study

In addition to those mentioned in Chapter 1 of this study, other variables to be considered when interpreting the results of this study hinge upon an issue which was alluded to in Chapter 2 wherein it was asserted that teaching effectiveness was contingent upon elements of the situation. How respondents rate teaching effectiveness depends upon a plethora of conditions, including but not limited to the specific environment where the study was conducted, the characteristics of the teachers and students responding to the questionnaire, and to the subject being studied. Environmental factors as basic as the cleanliness of the room, the colour of the wall paint, or the lack – or presence – of interruptions in a classroom could affect the respondents' opinions on any given day. Do tensions exist that could affect how effective teaching is judged between students who have been awarded scholarships as opposed to those who must pay tuition fees via bank loans? How does the support from the IT department, availability of teaching materials and technological aids such as LCD projectors influence respondents' perceptions, for example? Similarly, the degree of "safety" a student feels in the classroom will depend on many things such as the traffic faced on the way to university as well as the current style of teaching the teacher employs. Was the teaching method employed just prior to the time of evaluating teaching effectiveness collaborative, democratic, or authoritarian? How will the students' ratings of the questionnaire items be affected by the teacher administering the instrument? Will the presence of a new instructor to the cultural environment have a different effect on students' feedback as compared to a teacher who has understood and adapted or amended his or her teaching style to suit the students' learning needs? Is the cognitive style of instruction used by the teacher compatible with the majority of the students' cognitive characteristics? And how do we accurately measure the affective domain of teaching when no valid yardstick is available for measuring passion, happiness, safety consciousness or appreciation?

Other factors affecting the teaching environment arise from the culture of the university involved: is the administration supportive of the faculty or are they operating in a survival mode? Are the faculty members happy with their current

salaries and working conditions? Bourdieu & Passeron (1990) illuminate the essence of this issue when they explain, "… open or tacit disparagement of the bureaucracy of educational administrators and disciplinary officials constitutes one of the most economical springs of institutional charisma" (217). Are there also political, cultural, religious or racial tensions present at the institute where the study was conducted? How does the composition of the classroom in terms of male – female relationships affect the judgement process? Does age, gender, nationality, hair colour, female head coverings (or lack thereof), socioeconomic background, university status, education level and/or political persuasion of the teacher/professor affect the results? Similarly, how do factors such as the student's age, maturity level, family status and/or income level affect their judgements? Do working students rate effective teaching differently than do single mothers, for example? And what about the time of the day that the survey instrument is required to be completed by the respondents? Do results vary between early morning assessments when respondents are fully awake, as compared to the end of an exhausting day when all respondents might want to do is complete the survey instrument in as short a time as possible to leave the classroom for the day? How do other events such as the month of Ramadan wherein students and faculty might be fasting affect the survey results? Are respondents used to having the liberty of expressing their opinions or are they from societies which repress individual thought? Are professors/teachers expressing their own opinions of what constitutes effective teaching, or are their views skewed by what they might believe the institute or the profession requires of them? And finally, though in no way does this brief discussion on problematizing infer an all-inclusive discussion of all possible factors that could affect the survey results, how much influence from previously conducted effective teaching assessment instruments had upon respondents? Have the contents of previous instruments conditioned respondents to believe there are certain traits that all good teachers must exhibit, and therefore any traits that are foreign or unfamiliar to those listed on previous survey instruments are to be rated with suspicion? All the above issues – and perhaps many more than what have been briefly mentioned – suggest further studies should be conducted for replication and comparison across a wider diversity of environments in the Gulf region and beyond.

5.5 Personal reflections

Reflecting on the research process and results has proven to be a valuable exercise in helping me to explain the lessons learned from conducting this study. As a result, my learning experience may alert researchers who may wish to embark on a similar study to some of the possible surprises that surfaced on my journey. For example, two things which I had originally hoped to examine had to be aborted, primarily due to the small sample size. What seemed a logical attempt to connect differences in opinion between respondents on their perceptions of excellent teaching characteristics to country of origin or culture was not successful. This was a surprise and was abandoned only after Chi-square analysis produced an excessive amount of significant differences between the mediating factor of "origin" and questionnaire items. Careful analysis led to the realization that disparities in sample sizes were the cause of the differences, rather than what was hoped for, cultural differences. As a result of this learning opportunity, I was able to relate what critics of the qualitative methodology were saying: numbers alone can not always explain human behaviour. The link between cultural differences and respondent perceptions of excellent teaching still holds me in its grip, however, and I will therefore continue to remain alert to this potential source of learning as long as I am fortunate enough to have the opportunity to teach students from cultures other than my own.

The second link that I failed to expand my knowledge on was a possible relationship between how respondents from differing cultures viewed the age or years of teaching experience of the instructor and excellent teaching. This would have served a beneficial purpose, but as stated earlier, the small sample sizes as well as the limitations of this thesis have left me with a future challenge. More work needs to be done to investigate the characteristics of effective teachers, particularly in the Gulf region, and these findings must be made more transparent through such vehicles as TESOL Arabia and/or a communal, readily available web-based data bank. I hope my efforts and recommendations will help students, teachers, and others interested in attempting to establish a more comprehensive definition of effective teaching.

Ultimately, what was gained as a result of conducting this study will be reflected in my teaching. Specifically enlightening for me is that teachers who use methods, display behaviours or exhibit personality traits that are in conflict with student expectations run the risk of students disengaging and therefore not learning as effectively as they should, and/or expressing discontent on teacher evaluations. Also of much value to me is the revelation that students and teachers appear to be somewhat harmonized when it comes to drawing a portrait of the excellent teacher. Hence, I close this discussion with the conviction that students' voices are well worth listening to as guidance along my path towards the pursuit of teaching excellence.

APPENDIX 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF EXCELLENT TEACHING META-THEMES

Characteristics of Excellent Teaching **Sources**: results of primary studies, transcribed interviews of target population groups and results of published master's dissertations.	Feldman, 1988	Fernandez & Mateo, 1992	Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001	Miller *et al.*, 2001	Keller *et al.*, 1991	Walls *et al.*, 2002	Donaldson, 1991	Donaldson & Flannery , 1993	Ross-Gordon, 1991	Witcher *et al.*, 2001	Radford, 1980	Raymond, 2001	Researcher's exploratory interviews, 2005	Saafin, 2005	**Sum**	**Rank**
Country of study participants	Canada USA	Spain	Holland	China, South Africa, USA	USA	USA	USA	USA	USA	USA	USA KSA	Canada China UAE	UAE	UAE		
Target population (F = Faculty, AS = Adult Students, TS = Traditional Students, S = School children)	F, TS	TS, AS	F & S	F, TS, AS	TS & AS	F & AS	AS	AS, TS	AS	AS/TS	AS, TS **(EFL)**	AS, TS **(EFL)**	TS, F	TS **(EFL)**		
1. Is sensitive to and concerned with class level and progress	✔	✔	✔			✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				***9***	**10.5**
2. Is prepared/organized	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	11	**5.5**
3. Is knowledgeable of subject	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		10	**8**
4. Stimulates interest in course/subject	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✔			✔	✔	✓	***11***	**5.5**
5. Is enthusiastic for subject/towards teaching	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✓	***14***	**1.5**
6. Explains using simple terms	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	10	**8**
7. Is available to help students	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✓	***14***	**1.5**
8. Is concerned with, is friendly to, and respects students	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✓	***13***	**3.5**
9. Emphasizes outcomes/impact of instruction	✓	✓				✓	✓								4	**27**
10. Is fair and impartial in marking/evaluating students	✔		✔	✔			✔		✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	***9***	**10.5**
11. Uses relevant course materials	✓						✓		✓			✓	✓	✓	6	**16.5**
12. Has good elocutionary skills	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓							✓	6	**16.5**
13. Provides frequent, prompt, useful feedback	✓		✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓		✓		8	**12**
14. Is open to student's opinions, ideas and discussion	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✓	***13***	**3.5**
15. Uses appropriate teaching aids	✓				✓		✓					✓	✓	✓	6	**16.5**
16. Possesses intellectual expansiveness and intelligence	✓		✓				✓			✓	✓				5	**22**
17. Encourages students to think critically	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		10	**8**

APPENDIX 1

Characteristics of Excellent Teaching **Sources**: results of primary studies, transcribed interviews of target population groups and results of published master's dissertations.	Feldman, 1988	Fernandez & Mateo, 1992	Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001	Miller *et al.*, 2001	Keller *et al.*, 1991	Walls *et al.*, 2002	Donaldson, 1991	Donaldson & Flannery , 1993	Ross-Gordon, 1991	Witcher *et al.*, 2001	Radford, 1980	Raymond, 2001	Researcher's exploratory interviews, 2005	Saafin, 2005	**Sum**	**Rank**
18. Motivates students to do their best; sets high standards	✔		✔			✔	✔	✔							***5***	**22**
19. Uses clear objectives	✓			✓		✓	✓					✓			5	**22**
20. Has good personality	✔		✔	✔						✔	✔			✓	***6***	**16.5**
21. Encourages independent, self-initiated learning	✔		✔						✔			✔			***4***	**27**
22. Is productive in research and professional development	✓		✓	✓											3	**31.5**
23. Relates content to real life & other subjects		✓				✓		✓			✓	✓			5	**22**
24. Answers questions accurately		✓											✓		2	**40**
25. Gives credit to students whenever possible			✔		✔										***2***	**40**
26. Uses humour			✔	✔	✔		✔					✔		✓	***6***	**16.5**
27. Creates "good" learning environment			✓			✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	***6***	**16.5**
28. Is dedicated/committed			✔				✔	✔		✔	✔	✔		✓	***7***	**13**
29. Assignments/requirements clearly defined				✓								✓			2	**40**
30. Defines evaluation methods clearly				✓											1	**62**
31. Gives informative presentations				✓							✓				2	**40**
32. Leaves good impression on students				✔										✓	***2***	**40**
33. Moves about the classroom					✓										1	**62**
34. Provides many examples					✓									✓	2	**40**
35. Reviews before testing					✓									✓	2	**40**

Feldman

APPENDIX 1

Characteristics of Excellent Teaching **Sources**: results of primary studies, transcribed interviews of target population groups and results of published master's dissertations.	Feldman, 1988	Fernandez & Mateo, 1992	Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001	Miller *et al.*, 2001	Keller *et al.*, 1991	Walls *et al.*, 2002	Donaldson, 1991	Donaldson & Flannery , 1993	Ross-Gordon, 1991	Witcher *et al.*, 2001	Radford, 1980	Raymond, 2001	Researcher's exploratory interviews, 2005	Saafin, 2005	**Sum**	**Rank**
36. Provides outline for each class					✓										1	**62**
37. Knows students by name					✔										***1***	**62**
38. Encourages students to answer other students' questions					✓									✓	2	**40**
39. Provides "talk time" in class					✓									✓	2	**40**
40. Improves students' self-concept						✔									***1***	**62**
41. Uses a variety of teaching techniques/methods							✓	✓		✓				✓	4	**27**
42. Serves as a role model							✔								***1***	**62**
43. Fosters development of a community of learners							✓								1	**62**
44. Adapts to meet diverse needs							✓	✓						✓	3	**31.5**
45. Controls class							✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	6	**16.5**
46. Is flexible in scheduling/rescheduling tests and deadlines									✔					✓	***2***	**40**
47. Demonstrates leadership										✓					1	**62**
48. Encourages student participation										✓				✓	2	**40**
49. Knows how to teach										✓					1	**62**
50. Treats students as equals										✔				✓	***2***	**40**
51. Is strict										✔	✔		✔	✓	***4***	**27**
52. Is educated and cultured											✓				1	**62**

APPENDIX 1

Characteristics of Excellent Teaching **Sources**: results of primary studies, transcribed interviews of target population groups and results of published master's dissertations.	Feldman, 1988	Fernandez & Mateo, 1992	Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001	Miller *et al.*, 2001	Keller *et al.*, 1991	Walls *et al.*, 2002	Donaldson, 1991	Donaldson & Flannery , 1993	Ross-Gordon, 1991	Witcher *et al.*, 2001	Radford, 1980	Raymond, 2001	Researcher's exploratory interviews, 2005	Saafin, 2005	**Sum**	**Rank**
53. Is patient										✓	✓			✓	***3***	**31.5**
54. Has strong personality											✓				***1***	**62**
55. Does group work											✓	✓	✓	✓	4	**27**
56. Gives lots of tests												✓	✓	✓	3	**31.5**
57. Encourages students to find their own answers												✓		✓	2	**40**
58. Teaches with a purpose													✓		1	**62**
59. Has lots of teaching experience													✓		1	**62**
60. Caring for teaching words														✓	1	**62**
61. Willing to repeat explanation														✓	1	**62**
62. (Not) Asking students to do things they did not teach														✓	1	**62**
63. (Not) Actually teaching														✓	1	**62**
64. (Not) Following a lecturing style														✓	1	**62**
65. Checking students' understanding														✓	1	**62**
66. Selecting a diversity of interesting topics														✓	1	**62**
67. Minimizing lecturing time														✓	1	**62**
68. Organizing competition in classroom														✓	1	**62**
69. Providing test practice														✓	1	**62**

APPENDIX 1

Characteristics of Excellent Teaching **Sources**: results of primary studies, transcribed interviews of target population groups and results of published master's dissertations.	Feldman, 1988	Fernandez & Mateo, 1992	Beishuizen *et al.*, 2001	Miller *et al.*, 2001	Keller *et al.*, 1991	Walls *et al.*, 2002	Donaldson, 1991	Donaldson & Flannery , 1993	Ross-Gordon, 1991	Witcher *et al.*, 2001	Radford, 1980	Raymond, 2001	Researcher's exploratory interviews, 2005	Saafin, 2005	**Sum**	**Rank**
70. Giving homework														✓	1	**62**
71. Benefited students														✓	1	**62**
72. Using computer technology														✓	1	**62**
73. Investing the library														✓	1	**62**
74. Involving students in authentic speaking projects														✓	1	**62**
75. Communicating with students in English														✓	1	**62**
76. Correcting students' speaking mistakes														✓	1	**62**
77. Smiling at the students														✓	1	**62**
Total number of characteristics identified in this study	22	13	22	18	14	16	27	16	14	18	19	18	21	49		
Consistency with Feldman's top 22	22 100%	11 50%	18 82%	13 59%	5 23%	13 59%	19 86%	11 50%	16 73%	9 41%	11 50%	11 50%	13 59%	12 55%		

Average consistency with Feldman = **57%**

Notes: 1. Italicized bold text indicates ***Personality*** factors; non-highlighted text indicates **Ability** factors.

2. Total = 77 characteristics: Ability = 52 (67.5%); ***Personality*** = 25 (32.5%).

3. The initial 5 most frequently mentioned traits are personality; 6 of the top 10 are personality.

4. All of Feldman's 22 instructional dimensions are located in the top 27 ranked characteristics.

APPENDIX 2

DATA COLLECTING INSTRUMENT

STAGE ONE - STUDENT

Demographic Data - Student

Male ☐ **Female** ☐

First language _____

Nationality _____

Program of study (choose one only)

☐ **IEP** ☐ **Major***

* If you are in your major, what year are you currently in?

☐ **First** ☐ **Third**

☐ **Second** ☐ **Final**

Interview Questions

1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching?

Note: Please do NOT include any names.

2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching?

Note: Please do NOT include any names.

3. Twenty years from now, what do you think you will remember the most from your best university teachers/professors?

APPENDIX 3

DATA COLLECTING INSTRUMENT

STAGE ONE - FACULTY

Demographic Data - Teacher

Male ☐ **Female** ☐

First language _____

Nationality _____

Number of years teaching _____

Teaching rank (choose one only)

- ☐ **IEP teacher**
- ☐ **Assistant professor**
- ☐ **Professor**
- ☐ **Other** (please specify) _____

Interview Questions

1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching?

Note: Please do NOT include any names.

2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching?

Note: Please do NOT include any names.

3. Twenty years from now, what do you hope your students will remember the most about your teaching?

APPENDIX 4

TRANSCRIPTIONS OF STAGE ONE - TAPED INTERVIEWS
SAMPLES FROM EACH OF THE FOUR DIFFERENT POPULATION GROUPS

IEP INSTRUCTOR

Question 1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

INSTRUCTOR 1:

OK - Hmmm … Let's see … knowing your topic and knowing the curriculum for your class or the level that you're at – and also knowing about your students and their needs and their disabilities, let's say ... knowing how to give the right amount and not too much. So the idea of quality over quantity ummm .. and remembering that these students – at least in our case – they are much .. they don't have the ability to be much more mature than they are .. so you have to know about that limitation and at least be fair with them, not giving in to them in all cases but being aware of that so you can help them to grow.

Question 2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

INSTRUCTOR 1:

In this setting or in any setting?

Interviewer: Preferably in this setting

OK – in a university setting … OK … umm definitely poor teaching means giving in to students' requests to make changes or the changes to the amount of information that they need to be responsible for .. or the .. let's say the depth of their ahh knowledge – it can't be just be just simple memorization of the information … it has to be much deeper than what they had in high school – and so I guess my answer is that something that looks like high school teaching I would say is not appropriate here. We have to ask them to take a step up and use their critical thinking skills. Umm, I think bad teaching also would be covering too many things, too much material you know and being controlled not by the student but controlled by the book or curriculum. Umm also poor teaching is also is ignoring the students, I mean ignoring their needs saying OK this is the curriculum this is what you have to meet but without making the judgments semester by semester and not seeing the differences in students so there's some kind of sophisticated measurement of the students there.

Question 3. Twenty years from now, what do you hope your students will remember the most about your teaching?

INSTRUCTOR 1:

Hmmm … I don't know about twenty years from now, but I hope what they'll appreciate from me as a teacher is that I wanted to help them to think, to become independent … to become able to find information on their own and also I hope that they will be excited about getting information and continuing to learn.

APPENDIX 4

IEP STUDENT

Question 1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

STUDENT 2:
Well, there are many teachers around the world and .. umm… in my opinion teachers must have good characteristics. First, teachers must be able to make the subject they teach easier for students to understand by giving more examples and exercises. Also, good teachers must respect their students because that will encourage students to respect them and make a good relation between them. Moreover, teachers must be able to answer any question that students ask them and at any time so the student will feel more comfortable and understand the subject. Also, I believe that a good teacher must give his students homework about the subject they study so they can understand it more by doing it. And ahh… yah, finally, teachers must have a good control in the class so the students won't have the choice to make noisy in the class.

Question 2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

STUDENT 2:
O.K. … There are many worst characteristics in the university teachers like dishonesty, racism, and not respect the students. These worst characteristics make the level of the education in the university very low, and make a bad reputation for the university. These bad characteristics let the student hate the teacher and let the student hate to study. .. and racism makes the students hate each other … students who are different than them in religion or skin colour. That's the worst ones.

Question 3. Twenty years from now, what do you think you will remember the most from your best university teachers/professors?

STUDENT 2:

In my opinion, I think first I will remember the teacher who was kind with his students and he treats with them well, as they are men and women. Second, he gave his students useful information that helps them in their life… and … ammm … how he interacts with his students and was always prepared for the classes. The last thing is that he understands the student's jokes and makes some joke in the class while he is giving the lesson to make it more interesting, more fun.

APPENDIX 4

SCIENCE STUDENT

Question 1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

STUDENT 7:
Yah. Yup. I think one of the most useful characteristics is the teacher personality. I think the way he presents himself or herself from the first class it affects a lot … it's like the stereotype of what we're going to have in our course. Amm, I also think the teacher has to be helpful and he has to understand the students' situations – he has to understand about the way I think and also like not always serious … amm make us move from the serious mood 'cause I think when he said a joke in the middle of the class the information just sticks in our minds. And also, ahh, I don't like PowerPoint presentations, I like hand writing on the board, I like him or her to solve problems and give examples. And also in my point of view I think the teacher must relate the theory or information to our reality. For example, our teachers in this university are mostly from America or Canada and we are from the GCC and sometimes they are giving us examples and we don't … we can't even imagine the city or the place they are using for examples. This is for the type of courses that need discussion or the types of courses that need solving. I like them to give us homeworks, but with easy questions for practice, and more challenging questions which needs more effort. Umm more that this, umm … the time management of the teacher is very important because his time management will affect the students. It's better for him to not just talk about the … the lessons the concepts the book I think it's better for him to give us his experience because we are here not only just to learn about books, about chemistry and math. I think we have to learn more about life experiences. Exchanging experiences. That's it.

Question 2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

STUDENT 7:
Yah ... I think that those teachers who evaluate our work just from the way we look, from our face. Some teachers think that we locals don't have the ability of the other students ... we are facing this problem in our majors … discrimination ... . For example, one of my teachers couldn't believe that I could do such a good job on my lab assignment and I had to tell him: "Sir, just because I'm wearing an abaya and I cover my hair doesn't mean that I don't have a mind". He feel embarrassed – it was one of the worst cases. And ahh ... also ahh those teachers who don't give us enough homeworks and enough explanations and they don't give us enough exams – just one final exam. It's not enough. And also those teachers who are giving 35 or 40 percent of the course grade on the final. I don't think it's the right way. And also, let's us see … the worst teachers … no, yah, when they don't give us enough time to do our homeworks – they must give us at least one week to work on it because we have a lot of things to do, not just this one course – I don't like flexibility in the grading .. some teachers mark depending on the students' faces … for example, some students are liked more than me … it doesn't mean that because I'm a female that I can't give, that I can't do the job. And that's it.

APPENDIX 4

Question 3. Twenty years from now, what do you think you will remember the most from your best university teachers/professors?

STUDENT 7:
Ammm … the people, the teachers who are nice, from different backgrounds, origins, different cultures when they give us information and their experiences ... what they taught me ahh actually I like to work with new information, I like to exchange information - some of our instructors are encouraging us to complete our master's degree and one of the teachers, he put this idea in my mind and now I think people will respect me more if I have my master's degree and my PhD – also something I can't forget - is ahhhm, what they taught me … O.K. … enough?

SCIENCE PROFESSOR

Question 1. In your opinion, what constitutes effective/good university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

INSTRUCTOR 4:
I think the fundamental level is that you understand the area yourself, that you are knowledgeable. The second step then is to convey it to the students and I think there the ahh challenge, especially in an international environment is to convey it to your students in a way that is interesting. I mean being able to making a dry subject lively and relevant to students. And then I think the other thing is a just logical, sequential presentation of the subject.

Question 2. In your opinion, what constitutes ineffective/poor university teaching? Note: Please do NOT include any names.

INSTRUCTOR 4:
Ask the students! Hah hah hah ha. Ahh… I think not being prepared, randomness in teaching and explanation no sequence no structure ahh … and a lot is just teaching style – if you are just, just read from the slides, boring or don't allow the students to ask questions the that's ineffective.

Question 3. Twenty years from now, what do you hope your students will remember the most about your teaching?

INSTRUCTOR 4:
Hmmm… . I think that very much depends on the setting. Amm, I think for here, ahh I think I'd want the students to remember me as someone with integrity – who treated every one the same and that I was fair.

APPENDIX 5

EFFECTIVE TEACHING VERB REFERENT CATEGORIES EXTRACTED FROM INTERVIEWS: SUMMED, CATEGORIZED AND RANKED

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING

		Frequency					
	VERB REFERENT STATEMENTS	**IEP Students**	**Science Students**	**IEP Teachers**	**Science Faculty**	**Sum**	**Rank**
1	Makes lessons understandable	8	13	6	16	**43**	**1**
2	***Is friendly to students***	***17***	***8***	***6***	***2***	***33***	***2.5***
3	***Respects students***	***13***	***4***	***9***	***7***	***33***	***2.5***
4	***Encourages students***	***16***	***4***	***9***	***3***	***32***	***4***
5	***Makes classes interesting/fun***	***13***	***6***	***10***	***2***	***31***	***5***
6	Makes students think	5	3	6	6	**20**	**6**
7	Answers all students' questions	5	2	6	5	**18**	**7.5**
8	Really knows subject knowledge	3	2	6	7	**18**	**7.5**
9	***Is fair***	***6***	***0***	***4***	***7***	***17***	***9***
10	***Is adaptable/flexible***	***11***	***0***	***1***	***1***	***13***	***10***
11	Has good class control	5	2	5	0	**12**	**11**
12	***Is enthusiastic about teaching***	***5***	***2***	***2***	***2***	***11***	***12***
13	Is well prepared for class	3	0	5	0	**8**	**13**
14	Teachers with a purpose	2	2	2	1	**7**	**14**
15	Provides punctual feedback	2	0	3	0	**5**	**15.5**
16	Uses latest technology/techniques	0	1	2	2	**5**	**15.5**
17	Has lots of experience	2	0	0	1	**3**	**17.5**
18	Does group work	0	2	0	1	**3**	**17.5**
19	***Is strict***	***2***	***0***	***0***	***0***	***2***	***19.5***
20	Gives lots of tests	0	1	1	0	**2**	**19.5**
					Total sum	**316**	

Note: italicized bold text indicates ***Personality*** traits; non-highlighted text indicates Ability factors.

Ability characteristics		144	46%
Personality characteristics		***172***	***54%***
	Sum	**316**	**100%**

APPENDIX 6

INEFFECTIVE TEACHING VERB REFERENT CATEGORIES EXTRACTED FROM INTERVIEWS: SUMMED, CATEGORIZED AND RANKED

CHARACTERISTICS OF INEFFECTIVE TEACHING

		Frequency					
	VERB REFERENT STATEMENTS	IEP Students	Science Students	IEP Teachers	Science Faculty	Sum	Rank
1	***Is disrespectful to students***	***19***	***3***	***3***	***2***	***27***	***1***
2	***Doesn't care if students understand***	***6***	***4***	***7***	***8***	***25***	***2***
3	***Is boring***	***4***	***9***	***6***	***4***	***23***	***3***
4	Can not explain well	2	7	2	8	**19**	**4**
5	***Is inaccessible***	***1***	***2***	***5***	***4***	***12***	***5.5***
6	Has limited knowledge	2	1	4	5	**12**	**5.5**
7	***Is too lenient***	***3***	***3***	***4***	***1***	***11***	***7***
8	Is unprepared for class	1	2	4	3	**10**	**8**
9	***Is unfair in grading***	***5***	***3***	***0***	***0***	***8***	***9.5***
10	Gives students excessively difficult tasks/tests	2	3	2	1	**8**	**9.5**
11	***Is only interested in money, not teaching***	***1***	***1***	***2***	***1***	***5***	***11***
12	***Does not understand students***	***0***	***3***	***0***	***1***	***4***	***12***
13	Manages classroom poorly	2	0	1	0	**3**	**13**
14	Does not teach at student level	0	1	0	1	**2**	**14**
15	Does not take attendance	1	0	0	0	**1**	**15.5**
16	***Takes student bribes***	***1***	***0***	***0***	***0***	***1***	***15.5***
17	***Brings personal problems into class***	***0***	***1***	***0***	***0***	***1***	***15.5***
18	Has bad accent	0	1	0	0	**1**	**15.5**
19	Is controlled by curriculum	0	0	1	0	**1**	**15.5**
20	Places too much weight on final exams	0	0	1	0	**1**	**15.5**
21	Has no training in teaching	0	0	0	1	**1**	**15.5**
22	***Cannot admit when he doesn't know answer to question***	***0***	***0***	***0***	***1***	***1***	***15.5***

Note: italicized bold text indicates ***Personality*** traits; non-highlighted text indicates Ability factors.

Total sum **177**

Ability characteristics		59	33%
Personality characteristics		***118***	***67%***
	Sum	**177**	**100%**

APPENDIX 7

TEACHING EXCELLENCE QUESTIONNAIRE - DRAFT
(STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE)

PART A

Male ❒ Female ❒ Age _____ First Language _____

Major _____ Nationality _____

Year of study (tick one only below)

❒ Intensive English Program (IEP)

❒ Freshman (1st year)

❒ Sophomore (2nd year)

❒ Junior (3rd year)

❒ Senior (4th year)

PART B

Please indicate (with a ✓) **how important** to you each one of the following statements is in defining the **excellent university teacher/professor**. Use the following scale:

Very Important **Important** **Undecided** **Somewhat Important** **Least Important**

Excellent teachers/professors …	**Very Important**	**Important**	**Undecided**	**Somewhat Important**	**Least Important**
1. … are flexible.					
2. … show excitement/enthusiasm for the subject they teach.					
3. … give tests/quizzes frequently.					
4. … have a good sense of humour.					
5. … encourage student participation by inviting questions and discussion.					
6. … have a friendly personality.					
7. … allow students to learn cooperatively (*e.g. pair work, group work, student reports, etc.*).					
8. … are helpful to students outside of class.					
9. … have the ability to make difficult subjects easy to understand (*e.g. explain using simple terms, relate course materials to everyday life or other subjects, give lots of examples, etc.*).					
10. … are strict.					
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching (*e.g. Blackboard, Moodle, PowerPoint, simulation software, etc.*).					
12. … respect their students.					

Please turn over ⇩

Excellent teachers/professors …	Very Important	Important	Undecided	Somewhat Important	Least Important
13. … lecture for the entire class period.					
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.					
15. … challenge students to think critically.					
16. … have an expert knowledge of their subject.					
17 … ask for student feedback/comments on their teaching.					
18. … have good class control.					
19. … show they are well prepared and organized for every class.					
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.					
21. … treat all students equally.					
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.					
23. … have many years of teaching experience.					
24. … assign a lot of homework.					
25. … make classes interesting by using a variety of teaching aids and methods.					

PART C

1. In your opinion, what are the most important characteristics of the **excellent** university teacher/professor?

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. In your opinion, what are the most striking characteristics of the **ineffective/worst** university teacher(s)/professor(s)?

   _____

   _____

   _____

THANK YOU!

This survey has been approved by the XXXXXX_____ board.

APPENDIX 8

TEACHING EXCELLENCE QUESTIONNAIRE - DRAFT
(FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE)

PART A

Male ❒ Female ❒ First Language _____ Nationality _____

# of years teaching experience _____ What subject(s) or major(s) do you teach?

_____

Teaching rank (tick ✓ one only below)

❒ IEP Instructor
❒ Instructor
❒ Assistant Professor
❒ Professor
❒ Other (please specify) _____

Age (tick ✓ one only below)

❒ 21 - 29
❒ 30 - 39
❒ 40 – 49
❒ 50 - 59
❒ 60 or older

PART B

Please indicate (with a ✓) **how important** to you each one of the following statements is in defining the **excellent university teacher/professor**. Use the following scale:

Very Important **Important** **Undecided** **Somewhat Important** **Least Important**

Excellent teachers/professors …	**Very Important**	**Important**	**Undecided**	**Somewhat Important**	**Least Important**
1. … are flexible.					
2. … show excitement/enthusiasm for the subject they teach.					
3. … give tests/quizzes frequently.					
4. … have a good sense of humour.					
5. … encourage student participation by inviting questions and discussion.					
6. … have a friendly personality.					
7. … allow students to learn cooperatively (*e.g. pair work, group work, student reports, etc.*).					
8. … are helpful to students outside of class.					
9. … have the ability to make difficult subjects easy to understand (*e.g. explain using simple terms, relate course materials to everyday life or other subjects, give lots of examples, etc.*).					
10. … are strict.					

Please turn over ⇩

Excellent teachers/professors …	Very Important	Important	Undecided	Somewhat Important	Least Important
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching (*e.g. Blackboard, Moodle, PowerPoint, simulation software, etc.*).					
12. … respect their students.					
13. … lecture for the entire class period.					
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.					
15. … challenge students to think critically.					
16. … have an expert knowledge of their subject.					
17 … ask for student feedback/comments on their teaching.					
18. … have good class control.					
19. … show they are well prepared and organized for every class.					
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.					
21. … treat all students equally.					
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.					
23. … have many years of teaching experience.					
24. … assign a lot of homework.					
25. … make classes interesting by using a variety of teaching aids and methods.					

PART C

1. In your opinion, what are the most important characteristics of the **excellent** university teacher/professor?

   _____
   _____
   _____

2. In your opinion, what are the most striking characteristics of the **ineffective/worst** university teacher(s)/professor(s)?

   _____

   _____

THANK YOU!

This survey has been approved by the XXXXX _____ board.

APPENDIX 9

TEACHING EXCELLENCE QUESTIONNAIRE - FINAL
(STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE)

PART A

Male ❒ Female ❒ Age _____ First Language _____

Major _____ Nationality _____

Year of study (tick one only below)

❒ Intensive English Program (IEP)

❒ Freshman (1st year)

❒ Sophomore (2nd year)

❒ Junior (3rd year)

❒ Senior (4th year)

PART B

Please indicate (with a ✓) **how important** to you each one of the following statements is in defining the excellent university instructor/professor. Use the following scale:

Not Important **Somewhat Important** **Important** **Very Important**

Excellent instructors/professors …	**Not Important**	**Somewhat Important**	**Important**	**Very Important**
1. … make classes interesting.				
2. … maintain strict control over the class.				
3. … give many quizzes and tests.				
4. … use humour in the classroom.				
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.				
6. … are friendly to students.				
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.				
8. … are available to help students outside of class.				
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.				
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.				
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.				
12. … are respectful of their students.				

Please turn over

APPENDIX 9

Excellent instructors/professors …	**Not Important**	**Somewhat Important**	**Important**	**Very Important**
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.				
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.				
15. … require students to think critically.				
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.				
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.				
18. … expect students to become independent learners.				
19. … are always well prepared and organized.				
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.				
21. … have many years of teaching experience.				
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.				
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.				
24. … assign a lot of homework.				
25. … have a unique teaching style.				

PART C

1. In your own words, what are the most important characteristics of the **excellent** university instructor/professor?

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. In your own words, what are the most striking characteristics of the **ineffective/worst** university instructor/professor?

   _____

   _____

   _____

THANK YOU!

This questionnaire has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) from the University of Exeter, U.K. If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please contact Sylvie Raymond at ( ) or ( ).

APPENDIX 10

TEACHING EXCELLENCE QUESTIONNAIRE - FINAL
(FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE)

PART A

Male ❒ Female ❒ First Language _____ Nationality _____

# of years teaching experience _____ What subject(s) or major(s) do you teach?

_____

Teaching rank (tick ✓ one only below)

❒ IEP Instructor
❒ Instructor
❒ Assistant Professor
❒ Associate Professor
❒ Professor
❒ Other (please specify) _____

Age (tick ✓ one only below)

❒ 21 - 29
❒ 30 - 39
❒ 40 – 49
❒ 50 - 59
❒ 60 or older

PART B

Please indicate (with a ✓) **how important** to you each one of the following statements is in defining the excellent university instructor/professor. Use the following scale:

Not Important **Somewhat Important** **Important** **Very Important**

Excellent instructors/professors …	**Not Important**	**Somewhat Important**	**Important**	**Very Important**
1. … make classes interesting.				
2. … maintain strict control over the class.				
3. … give many quizzes and tests.				
4. … use humour in the classroom.				
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.				
6. … are friendly to students.				
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.				
8. … are available to help students outside of class.				
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.				
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.				
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.				
12. … are respectful of their students.				

Please turn over

APPENDIX 10

Excellent instructors/professors …	**Not Important**	**Somewhat Important**	**Important**	**Very Important**
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.				
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.				
15. … require students to think critically.				
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.				
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.				
18. … expect students to become independent learners.				
19. … are always well prepared and organized.				
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.				
21. … have many years of teaching experience.				
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.				
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.				
24. … assign a lot of homework.				
25. … have a unique teaching style.				

PART C

1. In your own words, what are the most important characteristics of the **excellent** university instructor/professor?

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. In your own words, what are the most striking characteristics of the **ineffective/worst** university instructor/professor?

   _____

   _____

   _____

THANK YOU!

This questionnaire has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) from the University of Exeter, U.K. If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please contact Sylvie Raymond at ( ) or ( ).

APPENDIX 11

PART B OF QUESTIONNIARE
PERSONALITY AND ABILITY TRAITS DIFFERENTIATED

Excellent teachers/professors …	**Not Important**	**Somewhat Important**	**Important**	**Very Important**
1. … make classes interesting.				
2. … maintain strict control over the class.				
3. … give many quizzes and tests.				
4. … use humour in the classroom.				
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.				
6. … are friendly to students.				
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.				
8. … are available to help students outside of class.				
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.				
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.				
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.				
12. … are respectful of their students.				
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.				
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.				
15. … require students to think critically.				
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.				
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.				
18. … expect students to become independent learners.				
19. … are always well prepared and organized.				
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.				
21. … have many years of teaching experience.				
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.				
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.				
24. … assign a lot of homework.				
25. … have a unique teaching style.				

Note: italicized bold text indicates ***Personality*** factors (11 total);
non-highlighted text indicates Ability factors (14 total).

APPENDIX 12

SAMPLE CONSENT FORM FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS

For Use in Research Involving Interviews, Surveys and Behavioral Interventions

Note: Bolded elements must be included in your consent form

CONSENT FORM

FOR QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY, CONTACT: (Principal investigator name, address, phone number and e-mail). Only principal investigators or faculty sponsors of student research whose names appear in the application as such may be listed here.

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in **a research study** on **(describe the project in non-technical language; include types of questions that will be asked, if applicable; explain purpose of the research)**.

You will be asked to **(describe the procedures. Examples could include answer questions, take a survey, take a test. Mention video/audio taping, if applicable, and describe what will become of tapes after use, e.g., shown at scientific meetings; describe the final disposition of the tapes).**

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with this study are **(describe foreseeable risks or discomfort to subjects; if none, state as such).** The benefits that may reasonably be expected to result from this study are **(describe any benefits; if none, state as such). We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study.** *(If applicable)* Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your employment/medical care, grade, standing at the university, etc.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation in this experiment will take approximately **(amount of time)**.

PAYMENTS: You will receive **(describe reimbursement; where there is none, state as such)** as payment for your participation. (*if applicable).*

SUBJECT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. (*If applicable:* If you agree, your identity will be made known in all written data resulting from the study. Otherwise,) Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

If you have questions about your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact—anonymously, if you wish— the Office of Graduate Studies & Research, ( ).

The extra copy of this consent form is for you to keep.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

Protocol Approval Date: _____
Protocol Expiration Date: _____

APPENDIX 13

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND LIFELONG LEARNING

CONSENT FORM

I have been fully informed about the aims and purposes of the project.

I understand that:

there is no compulsion for me to participate in this research project and, if I do choose to participate, I may at any stage withdraw my participation

I have the right to refuse permission for the publication of any information about me

any information which I give will be used solely for the purposes of this research project, which may include publications

If applicable, the information which I give may be shared between any of the other researcher(s) participating in this project in an anonymised form

all information I give will be treated as confidential

the researcher(s) will make every effort to preserve my anonymity

.....…….
.....
(Signature of participant)
(Date)

……
(Printed name of participant)

One copy of this form will be kept by the participant; a second copy will be kept by the researcher(s)

Contact phone number of researcher(s): Sylvie Raymond, (office)

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact:

Sylvie Raymond Instructor, Office , email:

Data Protection Act: The University of Exeter is a data collector and is registered with the Office of the Data Protection Commissioner as required to do under the Data Protection Act 1998. The information you provide will be used for research purposes and will be processed in accordance with the University's registration and current data protection legislation. Data will be confidential to the researcher(s) and will not be disclosed to any unauthorised third parties without further agreement by the participant. Reports based on the data will be in anonymised form.

APPENDIX 14

COVER LETTER TO FACULTY RESPONDENTS

January 30, 2006

Dear Colleagues:

Attached you will find a questionnaire developed as part of my doctoral thesis to determine opinions of the excellent teacher from your perspectives. My intent is to compare faculty and students' perceptions from this environment to see how they compare to each other and to studies conducted elsewhere.

As a fellow instructor, I understand that you have many responsibilities to attend to. However, completion of this instrument should only take about ***five minutes*** *of your time to complete, and I would be most grateful for your assistance.*

Please return the completed questionnaire to ( ) by Monday of next week (February 6th). The secretary will collect and return them to me.

If you have any concerns about the project that you would like to discuss, please contact me at the office at ( ) or email me at ( ).

Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sylvie Raymond

APPENDIX 15

PART C – CHARACTERISTICS OF **EFFECTIVE** AND INEFFECTIVE TEACHERS EXTRACTED FROM OPEN-ENDED QUESTION AND RANKED

	EFECTIVE TEACHERS VERB REFERENT STATEMENTS	English Students	Science Students	English Faculty	Science Faculty	Sum	Rank
1	***Makes class interesting/fun***	**11**	**14**	**15**	**10**	**50**	**1**
2	***Is friendly to students***	**16**	**10**	**6**	**5**	**37**	**2**
3	Really knows subject knowledge	6	1	14	6	27	3
4	***Cares about students' learning***	**8**	**1**	**12**	**4**	**25**	**4**
5	Makes lessons understandable	8	4	6	4	22	5
6	Is well prepared for class	5	3	8	2	18	6
7	***Is enthusiastic***	**5**		**5**	**7**	**17**	**7**
8	***Encourages students to think***	**2**		**7**	**7**	**16**	**8**
9	***Respects students***	**3**	**1**	**7**	**3**	**14**	**9**
10	***Has good teaching style***	**8**	**1**	**4**		**13**	**10.5**
11	***Understands how students think and feel***	**2**	**1**	**8**	**2**	**13**	**10.5**
12	***Gives support***	**3**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**11**	**12**
13	***Is approachable/available***	**1**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**10**	**13**
14	***Is fair***	**1**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**9**	**14**
15	***Has good sense of humour***	**3**	**2**		**2**	**7**	**15.5**
16	***Listens to students' questions & opinions***	**5**		**1**	**1**	**7**	**15.5**
17	Relates theory to outside world		1	3	2	6	17.5
18	Is professional	1		4	1	6	17.5
19	Has lots of experience	4	2			6	17.5
20	***Is adaptable/flexible***		**1**	**3**	**1**	**5**	**20**
21	***Is patient***	**3**		**1**		**4**	**21.5**
22	Develops new activities all the time	2			2	4	21.5
23	Makes students think			1	2	3	23.5
24	***Is kind***	**2**			**1**	**3**	**23.5**
25	Develops students' skills				2	2	25.5
26	***Is optimistic***	**1**			**1**	**2**	**25.5**
27	Provides punctual feedback	1			1	2	25.5
28	Uses clear objectives				2	2	25.5
29	Teaches students how to study	1			1	2	25.5
30	***Is honest***	**1**		**1**		**2**	**25.5**
31	***Interacts well with students***				**2**	**2**	**25.5**
32	***Has good imagination***				**2**	**2**	**25.5**
33	***Encourages students to improve***				**1**	**1**	**33.5**
34	***Has strong personality***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
35	***Is motivated***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
36	Gives lots of good homework		1			1	33.5
37	Does group work				1	1	33.5
38	***Is strict***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
39	Uses time wisely		1			1	33.5
40	Changes class location sometimes	1				1	33.5
41	***Has good self-presentation***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
42	***Works hard***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
43	***Makes students feel comfortable***	**1**				**1**	**33.5**
44	Involves whole class	1				1	33.5
45	Is intelligent				1	1	33.5
46	Is consistent				1	1	33.5
					Total sum	**363**	

Ability characteristics	107	29%
Personality characteristics	**256**	**71%**
Sum	**363**	**100%**

Note: italicized bold text indicates ***Personality*** factors; non-highlighted text indicates Ability factors.

APPENDIX 15

PART C – CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE AND **INEFFECTIVE** TEACHERS EXTRACTED FROM OPEN-ENDED QUESTION AND RANKED

	INEFFECTIVE TEACHERS VERB REFERENT STATEMENTS	English Students	Science Students	English Teachers	Science Faculty	Sum	Rank
1	***Doesn't care if students understand***	***10***	***2***	***13***	***17***	***42***	***1***
2	***Is inflexible***	***13***	***1***	***5***	***10***	***29***	***2***
3	***Is disrespectful to students***	***9***	***5***	***10***	***3***	***27***	***3.5***
4	Lectures only	8	3	8	8	27	3.5
5	Is boring	4	3	9	4	20	5
6	***Is unfair in grading***	***6***	***3***	***9***		***18***	***6***
7	***Does not understand students***	***3***	***4***	***6***	***4***	***17***	***7***
8	***Is only interested in money, not teaching***	***6***		***4***	***5***	***15***	***8***
9	Can not explain well	2	6	4	1	13	9
10	***Is inaccessible***		***1***	***7***	***4***	***12***	***10.5***
11	Is unprepared for class	4	1	2	5	12	10.5
12	***Is arrogant***		***1***	***5***	***6***	***12***	***10.5***
13	Assigns excessive homework	10	1			11	13
14	***Is unprofessional***	***1***	***2***	***3***	***3***	***9***	***14.5***
15	***Is unfriendly***	***4***		***1***	***4***	***9***	***14.5***
16	Does not involve students	2		5	1	8	16
17	***Gets angry easily/impatient***	***4***	***2***		***1***	***7***	***17***
18	Reads from text or slides only		2	3	1	6	18
19	***Does not answer students' questions***	***1***	***2***		***2***	***5***	***19***
20	Gives students excessively difficult tasks/tests	2	2			4	20.5
21	Lacks experience		1	2	1	4	20.5
22	***Is dishonest***	***1***		***2***		***3***	***22.5***
23	***Does not feel responsible for students' learning***	***1***	***2***			***3***	***22.5***
24	***Is too serious in class***	***2***	***1***			***3***	***22.5***
25	***Shows no sympathy***	***1***	***1***		***1***	***3***	***22.5***
26	***Is too lenient***		***1***		***1***	***2***	***25.5***
27	Does not teach at student level	1			1	2	25.5
28	Doesn't speak clearly		1		1	2	25.5
29	Gives excessive quizzes and tests	2				2	25.5
30	Places too much weight on final exams			1	1	2	25.5
31	Manages classroom poorly			1		1	30.5
32	***Makes students hate subject***		***1***			***1***	***30.5***
33	***Is suspicious***		***1***			***1***	***30.5***
34	***Is too religious***		***1***			***1***	***30.5***
					Total sum	**333**	

Ability characteristics	114	34%
Personality characteristics	***219***	***66%***
Sum	**333**	**100%**

Note: italicized bold text indicates ***Personality*** factors; non-highlighted text indicates Ability factors.

APPENDIX 16
PART C FINDINGS RANKED AND COMPARED AGAINST APPENDIX 1 META-THEMES

Characteristics of Excellent Teaching **Source**: Part C of questionnaire	English Students	Science students	English faculty	Science faculty	Sum	Rank
78. (1) Is sensitive to and concerned with class level and progress	***2***	***1***	***8***	***2***	***13***	***8***
79. (2) Is prepared/organized	5	4	8	2	19	7
80. (3) Is knowledgeable of subject	6	1	14	6	27	3
81. (4) Stimulates interest in course/subject	***20***	***16***	***20***	***11***	***67***	***2***
82. (5) Is enthusiastic for subject/towards teaching	***7***		***5***	***7***	***19***	***7***
83. (6) Explains using simple terms	**8**	**4**	**6**	**4**	**22**	**5**
84. (7) Is available to help students	***4***	***7***	***5***	***5***	***21***	***6***
85. (8) Is concerned with, is friendly to, and respects students	***28***	***14***	***25***	***15***	***82***	***1***
9. (10) Is fair and impartial in marking/evaluating students	***1***	***3***	***4***	***2***	***10***	***9***
10. (13) Provides frequent, prompt, useful feedback	1		1	1	3	15
11. (14) Is open to student's opinions, ideas and discussion	***5***		***1***	***1***	***7***	***10***
12. (16) Possesses intellectual expansiveness and intelligence	1		1	1	3	14
13. (17) Encourages students to think critically	3		12	10	25	4
14. (18) Motivates students to do their best; sets high standards				***1***	***1***	***16***
15. (19) Uses clear objectives				2	2	15
16. (20) Has good personality	***2***				***2***	***15***
17. (21) Encourages independent, self-initiated learning	***1***			***3***	***4***	***13***
18. (23) Relates content to real life & other subjects		1	3	2	6	11
19. (26) Uses humour	***3***	***2***		***2***	***7***	***10***
20. (27) Creates "good" learning environment	2				2	15
21. (32) Leaves good impression on students	***1***			***1***	***2***	***15***
22. (46) Is flexible in scheduling/rescheduling tests and deadlines		***1***	***3***	***1***	***5***	***12***
23. (48) Encourages student participation	1				1	16
24. (51) Is strict	***1***				***1***	***16***
25. (53) Is patient	***3***		***1***		***4***	***13***
26. (55) Does group work				1	1	16
27. (56) Gives lots of tests		1			1	16
28. (59) Has lots of teaching experience	4	2			6	11
				SUM Total	**363**	

Feldman

Notes: 1. Not all of Feldman's original 22 characteristics were indicated by study respondents. Feldman's characteristics 9, 11, 12, 15, and 22 were not indicated by the study respondents and were therefore eliminated from this table.

2. Rankings of original meta-themes table in Appendix 1 are indicated in brackets ( ). For example, item 9. (10) "Is fair and impartial in marking/evaluating students" above ranked 9th of the 28 items emerging from Part C, but was ranked as item 10 in Appendix 1 characteristics.

APPENDIX 17

DEMOGRAPHIC SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION

	Participant Type									
	English Faculty		Science Faculty		English Student		Science Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender										
Male	15	11.3	23	17.3	30	22.6	22	16.5	90	67.7
Female	21	15.8	5	3.8	14	10.5	3	2.3	43	32.3
First Language										
English	34	25.6	26	19.5	1	.8	3	2.3	64	48.1
Arabic	2	1.5	2	1.5	32	24.1	18	13.5	54	40.6
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	8.3	4	3.0	15	11.3
Geographic Origin										
Gulf	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	15.0	2	1.5	22	16.5
Levant	0	0.0	1	.8	9	6.8	14	10.5	24	18.0
African	1	.8	0	0.0	3	2.3	2	1.5	6	4.5
Asian	0	0.0	1	.8	11	8.3	5	3.8	17	12.8
Western	35	26.3	26	19.5	1	.8	2	1.5	64	48.1
Totals	**36**	**27.1**	**28**	**21.1**	**44**	**33.1**	**25**	**18.8**	**133**	**100**

APPENDIX 18

DEMOGRAPHIC SAMPLE - FREQUENCY AND PERCENTILE DISTRIBUTION

	Frequency	Percent
Academic Discipline		
English Faculty	36	27.1
Science Faculty	28	21.1
English Student	44	33.1
Science Student	25	18.8
Total	**133**	**100.1**
Gender		
Male	90	67.7
Female	43	32.3
Total	**133**	**100**
First Language		
English	64	48.1
Arabic	54	40.6
Other	15	11.3
Total	**133**	**100**
Geographic Origin		
Gulf	22	16.5
Levant	24	18.0
African	6	4.5
Asian	17	12.8
Western	64	48.1
Total	**133**	**99.9**

APPENDIX 19

QUESTIONNAIRE PERSONALITY AND ABILITY MEASURES
MEANS AND RANKS FROM OVERALL STUDY SAMPLE

Personality Measure	Mean	Personality Rank	Overall Rank
12. … are respectful of their students.	3.73	1	1
1. … make classes interesting.	3.69	2	2
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	3.67	3	3
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	3.56	4	6
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	3.53	5	7.5
6. … are friendly to students.	3.49	6	9
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	3.38	7	12
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	3.33	8	13
4. … use humour in the classroom.	3.11	9.5	16.5
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	3.11	9.5	16.5
25. … have a unique teaching style.	2.50	11	21
Average of means	**3.37**		

Ability Measure	Mean	Ability Rank	Overall Rank
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	3.65	1	4
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	3.57	2	5
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	3.53	3	7.5
15. … require students to think critically.	3.40	4.5	10.5
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	3.40	4.5	10.5
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	3.26	6	14
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	3.17	7	15
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	2.97	8	18
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	2.77	9	19
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	2.52	10	20
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	2.33	11	22
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	2.17	12	23
24. … assign a lot of homework.	2.02	13	24
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	1.68	14	25
Average of means	**2.89**		

APPENDIX 20

QUESTIONNAIRE PERSONALITY MEASURES
A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH STUDENTS' AND SCIENCE STUDENTS' MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	English Student		Science Student		Difference	
Personality Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
1. … make classes interesting.	3.75	1.5	3.64	3.5	+.11	-2
6. … are friendly to students.	3.75	1.5	3.36	6	+.39	-4.5
12. … are respectful of their students.	3.66	3	3.80	1	-.14	2
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	3.50	4	3.16	8	+.34	-4
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	3.43	5.5	3.32	7	+.11	-1.5
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	3.43	5.5	3.68	2	-.25	3.5
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	3.39	7	3.60	5	-.21	2
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	3.36	8	3.64	3.5	-.28	4.5
25. … have a unique teaching style.	3.16	9	2.92	10	+.24	-2
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	3.14	10	3.00	9	+.14	1
4. … use humour in the classroom.	3.02	11	2.88	11	+.14	0

APPENDIX 21

QUESTIONNAIRE PERSONALITY MEASURES
A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH FACULTY'S AND SCIENCE FACULTY'S MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	English Faculty		Science Faculty		Difference	
Personality Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	3.92	1	3.86	1	+.06	0
12. … are respectful of their students.	3.78	2	3.71	3.5	+.07	-1.5
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	3.64	3	3.54	5	+.10	-2
1. … make classes interesting.	3.56	4	3.82	2	-.26	2
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	3.50	5	3.71	3.5	-.21	1.5
6. … are friendly to students.	3.39	6	3.32	9.5	+.07	-3.5
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	3.31	7	3.46	6.5	-.15	0.5
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	3.14	8	3.43	8	-.29	0
4. … use humour in the classroom.	3.08	9	3.46	6.5	-.38	2.5
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	3.00	10	3.32	9.5	-.32	0.5
25. … have a unique teaching style.	1.75	11	2.04	11	-.29	0

APPENDIX 22

QUESTIONNAIRE PERSONALITY MEASURES
A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH STUDENTS' AND ENGLISH FACULTY'S MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	English Student		English Faculty		Difference	
Personality Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
1. … make classes interesting.	3.75	1.5	3.56	4	+.19	-2.5
6. … are friendly to students.	3.75	1.5	3.39	6	+.36	-4.5
12. … are respectful of their students.	3.66	3	3.78	2	-.12	1
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	3.50	4	3.31	7	+.19	-3
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	3.43	5.5	3.64	3	-.21	2.5
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	3.43	5.5	3.14	8	+.29	-2.5
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	3.39	7	3.92	1	-.53	6
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	3.36	8	3.50	5	-.14	3
25. … have a unique teaching style.	3.16	9	1.75	11	+1.41	-3
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	3.14	10	3.00	10	+.14	0
4. … use humour in the classroom.	3.02	11	3.08	9	-.06	2

APPENDIX 23

QUESTIONNAIRE PERSONALITY MEASURES
A COMPARISON OF SCIENCE STUDENTS' AND SCIENCE FACULTY'S MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	Science Student		Science Faculty		Difference	
Personality Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
12. … are respectful of their students.	3.80	1	3.71	3.5	+.09	-2.5
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	3.68	2	3.54	5	+.14	-3
1. … make classes interesting.	3.64	3.5	3.82	2	-.18	1.5
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	3.64	3.5	3.71	3.5	-.07	0
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	3.60	5	3.86	1	-.26	4
6. … are friendly to students.	3.36	6	3.32	9.5	+.04	-3.5
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	3.32	7	3.43	8	-.11	-1
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	3.16	8	3.46	6.5	-.30	1.5
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	3.00	9	3.32	9.5	-.32	-.5
25. … have a unique teaching style.	2.92	10	2.04	11	+.88	-1
4. … use humour in the classroom.	2.88	11	3.46	6.5	-.58	4.5

APPENDIX 24

QUESTIONNAIRE PERSONALITY MEASURES
A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' AND FACULTY'S
MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	Students		Faculty		Difference	
Personality Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
1. … make classes interesting.	3.71	1.5	3.67	3	+.04	-1.5
12. … are respectful of their students.	3.71	1.5	3.75	2	-.04	-0.5
6. … are friendly to students.	3.61	3	3.36	7	+.25	-4
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	3.52	4	3.59	4.5	-.07	-0.5
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	3.46	5.5	3.59	4.5	-.13	1
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	3.46	5.5	3.89	1	-.43	4.5
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	3.39	7	3.27	8	+.12	-1
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	3.38	8	3.38	6	0	2
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	3.09	9	3.14	10	-.05	-1
25. … have a unique teaching style.	3.07	10	1.88	11	+1.19	-1
4. … use humour in the classroom.	2.97	11	3.25	9	-.28	2

APPENDIX 25

QUESTIONNAIRE ABILITY MEASURES

A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH STUDENTS' AND SCIENCE STUDENTS' MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	English Student		Science Student		Difference	
Ability Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	3.57	1	3.52	3	+.05	-2
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	3.52	2	3.28	4	+.34	-2
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	3.45	3	3.64	1	-.19	2
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	3.32	4	3.60	2	-.28	2
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	3.20	5	2.88	8	+.32	-3
15. … require students to think critically.	3.14	6	3.24	5	-.10	1
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	3.05	7.5	2.60	9.5	+.45	-2
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	3.05	7.5	2.60	9.5	+.45	-2
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	3.00	9	3.16	6	-.16	3
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	2.70	10	3.04	7	-.34	3
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	2.61	11	2.40	11.5	+.21	-0.5
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	2.57	12	2.40	11.5	+.17	0.5
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	2.25	13	2.16	14	-.09	-1
24. … assign a lot of homework.	2.09	14	2.24	13	-.15	1

APPENDIX 26

QUESTIONNAIRE ABILITY MEASURES

A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH FACULTY'S AND SCIENCE FACULTY'S MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	English Faculty		Science Faculty		Difference	
Ability Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	3.83	1	3.93	1	-.10	0
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	3.58	2	3.61	3.5	-.03	-1.5
15. … require students to think critically.	3.56	3	3.75	2	-.19	1
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	3.50	4.5	3.21	6	+.29	-1.5
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	3.50	4.5	3.43	5	+.07	-0.5
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	3.47	6	3.61	3.5	-.14	2.5
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	3.31	7	3.18	7	+.13	0
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	3.11	8	3.00	8	+.11	0
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	2.72	9	2.57	9	+.15	0
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	2.28	10	1.89	11	+.39	-1
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	2.22	11	2.14	10	+.08	1
24. … assign a lot of homework.	2.11	12	1.57	13	+.54	-1
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	1.89	13	1.71	12	+.18	1
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	1.03	14	1.18	14	-.15	0

APPENDIX 27

QUESTIONNAIRE ABILITY MEASURES

A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH STUDENTS' AND ENGLISH FACULTY'S MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	English Student		English Faculty		Difference	
Ability Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	3.57	1	3.58	2	-.01	-1
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	3.52	2	3.83	1	-.31	1
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	3.45	3	3.47	6	-.02	-3
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	3.32	4	3.50	4.5	-.18	-0.5
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	3.20	5	3.31	7	-.11	-2
15. … require students to think critically.	3.14	6	3.56	3	-.42	3
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	3.05	7.5	2.72	9	+.33	-1.5
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	3.05	7.5	3.11	8	-.06	-0.5
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	3.00	9	3.50	4.5	-.50	4.5
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	2.70	10	2.22	11	+.48	-1
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	2.61	11	2.28	10	+.33	1
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	2.57	12	1.89	13	+.68	-1
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	2.25	13	1.03	14	+1.22	-1
24. … assign a lot of homework.	2.09	14	2.11	12	-.02	2

APPENDIX 28

QUESTIONNAIRE ABILITY MEASURES

A COMPARISON OF SCIENCE STUDENTS' AND SCIENCE FACULTY'S MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	Science Student		Science Faculty		Difference	
Ability Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	3.64	1	3.61	3.5	+.03	-2.5
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	3.60	2	3.21	6	+.39	-4
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	3.52	3	3.61	3.5	-.09	-0.5
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	3.28	4	3.93	1	-.65	3
15. … require students to think critically.	3.24	5	3.75	2	-.51	3
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	3.16	6	3.43	5	-.27	1
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	3.04	7	2.14	10	+.90	-3
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	2.88	8	3.18	7	-.30	1
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	2.60	9.5	2.57	9	+.03	0.5
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	2.60	9.5	3.00	8	-.40	1.5
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	2.40	11.5	1.71	12	+.69	-0.5
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	2.40	11.5	1.89	11	+.51	0.5
24. … assign a lot of homework.	2.24	13	1.57	13	+.67	0
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	2.16	14	1.18	14	+.98	0

APPENDIX 29

QUESTIONNAIRE ABILITY MEASURES
A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' AND
FACULTY'S MEANS, RANKS AND DIFFERENCES

	Students		Faculty		Difference	
Ability Measure	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Rank**
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	3.55	1	3.59	3	-.04	-2
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	3.52	2	3.53	4	-.01	-2
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	3.43	3	3.88	1	-.45	2
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	3.42	4	3.38	6	+.04	-2
15. … require students to think critically.	3.17	5	3.64	2	-.47	3
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	3.09	6	3.25	7	-.16	-1
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	3.06	7	3.47	5	-.41	2
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	2.88	8.5	2.66	9	+.22	-0.5
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	2.88	8.5	3.06	8	-.18	0.5
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	2.83	10	2.19	10	+.64	0
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	2.54	11	2.11	11	+.43	0
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	2.51	12	1.81	13	+.70	-1
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	2.22	13	1.09	14	+1.13	-1
24. … assign a lot of homework.	2.14	14	1.88	12	+.26	2

APPENDIX 30

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS – INDEPENDENT VARIABLE ASSOCIATION WITH PERSONALITY MEASURE (DEPENDENT VARIABLES)

	Mediating factors					
	Academic Discipline				**Gender**	
Personality Measure	x^2	*df*	*p*	x^2	*df*	*p*
1. … make classes interesting.	9.342	9	.406	**8.787**	**3**	**.032***
4. … use humour in the classroom.	**19.526**	**9**	**.021***	0.302	3	.960
6. … are friendly to students.	**26.493**	**9**	**.002***	2.562	3	.464
8. … are available to help students outside of class.	4.469	6	.613	3.878	2	.144
10. … show that they really like the subject they teach.	11.859	9	.221	1.528	3	.676
12. … are respectful of their students.	7.011	9	.636	6.606	3	.086
14. … make an effort to get to know their students.	11.933	9	.217	1.722	3	.632
17. … care about students succeeding in their course.	7.387	9	.597	5.182	3	.159
20. … are fair in grading and evaluating student work.	**19.367**	**9**	**.022***	0.540	3	.910
23. … welcome students' opinions/suggestions.	12.648	9	.179	6.897	3	.075
25. … have a unique teaching style.	**56.006**	**9**	**.000***	1.602	3	.659

APPENDIX 31

CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS – INDEPENDENT VARIABLE ASSOCIATION WITH ABILITY MEASURE (DEPENDENT VARIABLES)

	Mediating Factors					
	Academic Discipline				**Gender**	
Ability Measure	x^2	*df*	*p*	x^2	*df*	*p*
2. … maintain strict control over the class.	12.795	9	.172	.826	3	.843
3. … give many quizzes and tests.	**19.353**	**9**	**.022***	4.870	3	.182
5. … encourage students' questions and discussion.	**24.430**	**9**	**.004***	7.629	3	.054
7. … encourage students to learn in pairs/groups.	14.437	9	.108	2.427	3	.489
9. … make difficult subjects easy to learn.	13.202	9	.154	1.089	3	.780
11. … use the latest computer technology in their teaching.	**18.533**	**9**	**.029***	1.735	3	.629
13. … lecture (talk) for the entire class period.	**71.749**	**9**	**.000***	4.218	3	.239
15. … require students to think critically.	**22.378**	**9**	**.008***	1.472	3	.689
16. … have expert, up-to-date knowledge of their subject.	8.793	9	.457	7.016	3	.071
18. … expect students to become independent learners.	12.610	9	.181	1.982	3	.576
19. … are always well prepared and organized.	3.868	6	.695	.588	2	.745
21. … have many years of teaching experience.	**28.188**	**9**	**.001***	5.338	3	.149
22. … give frequent feedback about student progress.	13.163	9	.155	4.184	3	.242
24. … assign a lot of homework.	**21.118**	**9**	**.012***	5.117	3	.163

REFERENCES

Anderson, L.W. (2004). *Increasing teacher effectiveness*. 2nd edition. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO http://www.unesco.org/iiep.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. W.H. Freeman and Company.

Beishuizen, J. J., Hof, E., van Putten, C. M., Bouwmeester, S., & Asscher, J. J. (2001). Students' and teachers' cognitions about good teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(2), 185–201.

Bloom, B. S. (1984). *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Borich, G. D. (2000). *Effective teaching methods*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Brookfield, S. D. (1990). *The skillful teacher: On techniques, trust and responsiveness in the classroom.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryman, A. (Ed.). (1992). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Routledge.

Calderhead, J. (1996). *Teachers: Beliefs and Knowledge*. In D.C. Berliner & R.C. Calfee (Eds) Handbook of Educational Psychology, (pp.709-726). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Carson, B.H. (1996). Thirty years of stories. *Change*, Nov/Dec, 28(6), 10-17.

Carver, C. L. & Katz, D.S. (2004). Teaching at the Boundary of Acceptable Practice: What is a New Teacher Mentor to Do? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 449-462.

Centra, J.A. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cheng, Y.C., Mok, M.C. & Tsui, K.T. (Eds.). (2001). *Teaching Effectiveness and Teacher Development: Towards a New Knowledge Base*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education and Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Chickering, A. W. & Gamson, Z. F. (Eds.). (1991). *Applying the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clair, N. & Adger, C.T. (1999). *Professional Development for Teachers in Culturally Diverse Schools*, Online Resources: Digests, EDO-FL-99-08. Retrieved 6/25/2007 http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/profdvpt.html .

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education.* 5th edition, London: Routledge Falmer.

Cravens, T.F. (1996). *"Students' Perceptions of the Characteristics of Teaching Excellence*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Social Science Conference, Reno, NV. (ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE NO. ED 393478).

Cruickshank, D.R., & Haefele, D. (2001). Good teachers, plural. *Educational Leadership*, February, 58(5), 26-30.

Day, C. (2004). *A Passion for Teaching*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Donaldson, J.F. & Flannery, D. (1993). A triangulated study comparing adult college students perceptions of effective teaching with those of traditional students. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 57(3), 147–165.

Donaldson, J.F. (1991). An examination of similarities and differences among adults' perceptions of instructional excellence in off-campus credit course programming. *Innovative Higher Education*, 16(1), 59-78.

Dunne, R. & Wragg, T. (1994). *Effective Teaching*. London: Routledge.

Farquharson, M. (1989). "*Learning Styles of Arab Students in EFL Classrooms*", Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of other Languages, San Antonio, Texas. (ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE NO. ED 31174).

Feldman, K.A. (1988). Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view: Matched or mismatched priorities. *Research in Higher Education*, 28(4), 291-344.

Fernandez, J. & Mateo, M.A. (1992). Student evaluation of university teaching quality: Analysis of a questionnaire for a sample of university students in Spain. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52(3), 675-686.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). (1992). *Teacher Development and Educational Change.* London: Falmer Press.

Good, T. & Brophy, J. (2003). *Looking in Classroom.* 9th Edition. USA: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

Glasser, W. (1992). *The Quality of School: Managing students without coercion*. New York: Harper Collins.

Goleman, D. (2002). *The new leaders: Emotional intelligence at work*. London: Time Warner Books.

Habermas, J. (1972). *Knowledge and Human Interests* (Trans. J. Shapiro). London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1973). *Theory and Practice.* (Trans. J. Viertel). Beacon Press.

Hay McBer (2000). *Research into Teacher Effectiveness: A Model of Teacher Effectiveness*. A report by Hay McBer to the Department of Education and Employment, United Kingdom.

Hiebert, J. & Grouws, D. (2007). The Effects of Classroom Mathematics Teaching on Students' Learning. In Lester, F.K., *Second Handbook of Research on Mathematics Teaching and Learning* (371-404). New York: MacMillan

Hogan, R. (2005). *In Defense of Personality Measurement: New Wine for Old Whiners*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Human Performance. Retrieved 2/14/2008 http://www.hoganassessment.com/_hoganweb/documents/IndefenseofPersMeasurement.pdf .

Holliday, A. (2002). *Doing and Writing Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE.

House, E. (1991). Realism in Research. *Educational Researcher*, 20(6), 2-9+25.

Huling, L. & Resta, V. (2001). Teacher Mentoring as Professional Development, *ERIC Digest,* ED460125 Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. Retrieved 11/01/07 http://www.ericdigests.org/2002-3/mentoring.htm .

Keller, J.W., Mattie, N., Vodanovich, S.J., & Piotrowski, C. (1991). Teaching effectiveness: Comparisons between traditional and non-traditional college students. *Innovative Higher Education*, 15(2), 177-185.

Kyriacou, C. (1998). *Essential teaching skills*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Leinhardt, G. (1988). *Situated knowledge and expertise in teaching*. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Teachers' professional learning, (146-168). London: Falmer Press.

Leinhardt, G. (1990). Capturing craft knowledge in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 19(2), 18-25.

Leinhardt, G. (1993). On teaching. In R. Glasser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology*, Vol 4, 1-54.

Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lowyck, J. (1994). Teaching Effectiveness: An overview of studies. *Tijdschrift voor Onderwijsresearch*, 19(1), 17-25.

Maamouri, M., (1998). Arabic diglossia and its impact on the quality of education in the Gulf region. *Language Education and Human Development.* A paper presented at the Mediterranean Development: Moving Forward Workshop, Sept. 3-6, Marrakech, Morocco, 1-79.

Maynard, T. (2000). Learning to Teach or Learning to Manage Mentors? Experiences of school-based teacher training. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, Volume 8(1), 17–30.

McCabe, D.L., Feghali, T. & Abdallah, H. (2008). Academic Dishonesty in the Middle East: Individual and Contextual Factors. *Research in Higher Education, 49:451-467.*

Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning Qualitative Research.* London: Routledge.

Miller, J.L., Dzindolet, M.T., Weinstein, L., Xie, X., & Stones, C.R. (2001). Faculty and students' views of teaching effectiveness in the United States, China, and South Africa. *Teaching of Psychology*, 28(2), 138-142.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Parker, O. D. & Educational Services Staff, AFME American Friends of the Middle East (AMIDEAST), (1986). Cultural clues to the Middle Eastern student. In Valdes, J.M. (Ed.), *Culture Bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching*, (pp. 94-101). Cambridge University Press.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.* 2nd Edition. London: Sage.

Radford, A. E. (1980). *Outstanding teacher characteristics as perceived by Saudi Arabian ESL students and American college students*. An unpublished thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language, University of California, Los Angeles.

Raymond, S.M. (2001). *Excellent teaching: perceptions of Arab, Chinese and Canadian students*. In Voices of Arabia, Chapter 2: 17-30, University of Sheffield, U.K.

Richardson, V. (Ed.). (1997). *Constructivist Teacher Education: Building New Understandings*. London: Falmer Press.

Rogers, C.R. & Frieberg, H.J. (1969). *Freedom to Learn*. Prentice Hall.

Robertson, J. (1996). *Effective classroom control; Understanding teacher - student relationships*. Great Britain: Hodder & Stoughton.

Ross-Gordon, J.M. (1991). Critical incidents in the college classroom: What do adult undergraduates perceive as effective teaching? *Continuing Higher Education Review*, 55(1&2), 14-33.

Saafin, S.M. (2005). *An Investigation into Arab Students' Perceptions of Effective EFL Teachers at University Level*. An unpublished thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education, University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom.

Salomon, G. (1991). Transcending the Qualitative-Quantitative Debate: The Analytic and Systemic Approaches to Educational Research. *Educational Researcher*, August-September, 10-18.

Shulman, L.S. (2004). *Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Skinner, B.F. (1957). *Verbal Behavior*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Smith, W.S., Mendendorp, C.L., Ranck, S., Morrison, K., & Kopfman, J. (1994). The prototypical features of the ideal professor from the female and male undergraduate perspective: The role of verbal and nonverbal communication. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 5(20), 5-22.

Sternberg, R.J., & Horvath, J.A. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24(6), 9-17.

Stones, E. (1992). *Quality teaching: A sample of cases*. London: Routledge.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Villegas-Reimers, E. (2003). *Teacher Professional Development: an international review of the literature*. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press.

Walls, R.T., Nardi, A. H., von Minden, A.M., & Hoffman, N. (2002). The characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. *Teacher Educational Quarterly*, Winter, 29(1), 39-48.

Waxman, H.C. & Walberg, H.J. (Eds.). (1991). *Effective Teaching: Current Research*. Berkeley: McCrutchan.

Wellington, J.J., (1996). *Methods and Issues in Educational Research*. University of Sheffield Division of Education.

Williams M. & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A social constructivist approach*. U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Witcher, A.E., Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Minor, L.C. (2001). Characteristics of effective teachers: Perceptions of preservice teachers. *Research in the Schools*, 8(2), 45-57.

Wubbels, T., Levy, J., & Brekelmans, M. (1997). Paying attention to relationships. *Educational Leadership*, April, 54(7), 82-86.

Yoder, J., Shaw, L., Siyakwazi, B., & Kaarina, Y. (1993). *Elements of "Good Teaching": A comparison of educational students' perceptions in Botswana, California, Finland and Zimbabwe*. A paper presented to the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, Annapolis, Maryland, March 13-15, 1992.

Yost, D.S., Sentner, S.M., & Forlenza-Bailey, A. (2000). An Examination of the Construct of Critical Reflection: Implications for Teacher Education Programming in the 21st Century. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 5(2), 39-65.

Zeek, C., Foote, M., & Walker, C. (2001). Teacher Stories and Transactional Inquiry: Hearing the Voices of Mentor Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(5), 377-385.